arXiv:q-alg/9707005v1 3 Jul 1997

ON BC TYPE BASIC HYPERGEOMETRIC ORTHOGONAL POLYNOMIALS

J.V. STOKMAN

Abstract. The five parameter family of multivariable Askey-Wilson polynomials is studied with four parameters generically complex. The multivariable Askey-Wilson polynomials form an orthogonal system with respect to an explicit (in general complex) measure. A partially discrete orthogonality measure is obtained by shifting the contour to the torus while picking up residues. A parameter domain is given for which the partially discrete orthogonality measure is positive. The orthogonality relations and norm evaluations for multivariable q-Racah polynomials and multivariable big and little q-Jacobi polynomials are proved by taking suitable limits in the orthogonality relations for the multivariable Askey-Wilson polynomials. In particular new proofs of several well known q-analogues of the Selberg integral are obtained.

1. Introduction

In [25] Macdonald introduced a remarkable family of multivariable (q-)orthogonal polynomials associated with root systems (the so called Macdonald polynomials). The Macdonald polynomials interpolate various families of special functions associated with groups, such as spherical functions on real semisimple Lie groups ($q = 1$), spherical functions on semisimple p-adic groups ($q = 0$) and characters of compact semisimple Lie groups. They also arise as spherical functions on certain quantum symmetric spaces (see for instance [29], [31]).

Recent work by Cherednik (see for instance [8], [9], [10]) has shown that these polynomials are closely related with certain representations of affine Hecke algebras. Many properties of the polynomials can be derived by this approach while they were first untractable or could only be proved for very special parameter values from the (quantum) group interpretation. In particular the explicit evaluations for the quadratic norms of the Macdonald polynomials, which were conjectured by Macdonald [25], have been proved by Cherednik [8] using this approach.

In this paper we will consider families of multivariable q-orthogonal polynomials associated with the non-reduced root system BC. Koornwinder [24] extended the three parameter families of BC type Macdonald polynomials to a five parameter multivariable generalization of the well-known four parameter family of Askey-Wilson polynomials [6]. Van Diejen [12] evaluated the quadratic norms of the multivariable Askey-Wilson polynomials using so called Pieri formulas.

Date: July, 1997.

1991 *Mathematics Subject Classification.* Primary: 33D45; Secondary: 33D25.

Key words and phrases. multivariable basic hypergeometric orthogonal polynomials, multivariable Askey-Wilson polynomials, multivariable q-Racah polynomials, multivariable big and little q-Jacobi polynomials, q-Selberg type integrals, residue calculus.

The author received financial support by NWO/Nissan.

The one-variable Askey-Wilson polynomials contain various interesting families of basic hypergeometric orthogonal polynomials as special cases or as limit cases (these families are collected in the Askey-Wilson scheme, see [6], [23]). In particular the Askey-Wilson scheme contains the families of q-Racah polynomials [5], big q-Jacobi polynomials [2] and little q-Jacobi polynomials [1]. These three families were recently also studied in the multivariable setting.

The multivariable q-Racah polynomials [14] can be considered as multivariable Askey-Wilson polynomials for which the parameters satisfy a particular truncation condition. In [14] it was shown that they are orthogonal with respect to a finite, discrete orthogonality measure. The multivariable big and little q-Jacobi polynomials [32] can be considered as limit cases of rescaled multivariable Askey-Wilson polynomials in which some of the parameters tend to infinity (see [35]). In [32] it was shown that they are orthogonal with respect to infinite discrete measures (which can most conveniently be expressed in terms of multidimensional Jackson integrals). The orthogonality measure for the three limit cases was obtained by repeating the techniques used by Macdonald for the Macdonald polynomials (and similarly by Koornwinder for the multivariable Askey-Wilson polynomials). The quadratic norm evaluations for the multivariable q-Racah polynomials were obtained in [14] by use of Pieri formulas (see [13] for the constant term identity, i.e. the quadratic norm evaluation of the unit polynomial).

In this paper the orthogonality relations and norm evaluations for the multivariable q-Racah polynomials, big and little q-Jacobi polynomials are proved by taking suitable limits in the orthogonality relations and norm evaluations for the Askey-Wilson polynomials. We proceed as follows. In section 2 the orthogonality relations for the Askey-Wilson polynomials obtained by Koornwinder [24] and the quadratic norm evaluations obtained by van Diejen [12] are extended to the case where four of the five parameters are generically complex. The extended orthogonality measure is an absolutely continuous complex measure with weight function identical to the weight function considered by Koornwinder [24], but with a suitably deformed integration contour. If all the four parameters have moduli < 1 then the n-torus T^n may be chosen as integration contour and Koornwinder's [24] orthogonality measure is recovered.

In section 3 a residue calculus is developed for the complex orthogonality measure of section 2. The orthogonality relations and norm evaluations for the multivariable Askey-Wilson polynomials can be reformulated with respect to partially discrete orthogonality measures by use of this calculus.

In section 4 the limit from multivariable Askey-Wilson polynomials to multivariable q-Racah polynomials is studied on the level of the orthogonality measures. A suitable partially discrete orthogonality measure for the multivariable Askey-Wilson polynomials is rescaled such that certain common poles of the completely discrete weights become zeros for the continuous parts of the orthogonality measure. These zeros cause the vanishing of the continuous parts of the orthogonality measure in the limit. We end up with a finite discrete measure, which is easily recognized as the measure of the multivariable q-Racah polynomials. We obtain new proofs of the orthogonality relations and norm evaluations for the multivariable q-Racah polynomials, simply by taking the limit in the corresponding results for the multivariable Askey-Wilson polynomials. See [36] for the use of this idea in the one-variable case.

In section 5 the residue calculus of section 3 is used to deform the integration contour of the orthogonality measure for the multivariable Askey-Wilson polynomials (cf. section 2) to the n-torus T^n. We obtain a partially discrete orthogonality measure which is positive for a large parameter domain. In particular the parameter values which occur in the limits from multivariable Askey-Wilson polynomials to multivariable big and little q-Jacobi polynomials lie in this parameter domain.

In sections 6 and 7 these two limits are taken in the (suitably rescaled) positive, partially discrete orthogonality measure for the Askey-Wilson polynomials. The partially continuous contributions (which are supported on subtori of T^n) disappear in these limits because the corresponding weight functions tend to zero, while the support of the completely discrete part of the measure blows up to an infinite set. We end up with the orthogonality measures of the multivariable little and big q-Jacobi polynomials. The orthogonality relations and norm evaluations for the multivariable little and big q-Jacobi polynomials are obtained by taking limits of the corresponding results for the multivariable Askey-Wilson polynomials. The rigorous proofs of the limits of the orthogonality measures are postponed to section 8 and 9.

The constant term identities which are obtained as special cases of the quadratic norm evaluations for the multivariable little and big q-Jacobi polynomials reduce to well known q-analogues of the Selberg integral. The constant term identity for the multivariable little q-Jacobi polynomials (Corollary 6.5) is known as the Askey-Habsieger-Kadell formula (see [4],[19],[21]) and was proved in full generality by Aomoto [3]. The constant term identity for the multivariable big q-Jacobi polynomials with one of the parameters discrete (Corollary 7.7) was conjectured by Askey [4] and proved by Evans [15]. The constant term identity in the general form (Corollary 7.6) is equivalent to Tarasov's and Varchenko's constant term identity [37, Theorem (E.10)].

The method of proving the orthogonality relations and norm evaluations for the one-variable q-Racah, big and little q-Jacobi polynomials by considering them as limit cases of the Askey-Wilson polynomials was discussed in detail in [36]. Although the computations are much more involved in the multivariable setting, the techniques we employ here are essentially the same as in the one-variable case (cf. [36]).

Finally let me note that the starting points in this article are the orthogonality relations and the Pieri formulas for the five parameter family of multivariable Askey-Wilson polynomials, together with an explicit second order q-difference operator which diagonalizes the multivariable Askey-Wilson polynomials (see the proof of Theorem 2.6). A complete proof of the Pieri formulas is at present only published for a four parameter subfamily [12]. On the other hand, the affine Hecke-algebraic approach to the study of orthogonal polynomials related to root systems as mentioned earlier in the introduction can in fact be worked out for the complete five parameter family of multivariable Askey-Wilson polynomials (this is announced in [28] and worked out in more detail in [30]). As van Diejen remarked in [12, note added in proof], this approach turns out to imply all the results in [12] for the complete five parameter family of multivariable Askey-Wilson polynomials. In the proof of Theorem 2.6 the explicit Pieri formulas for the complete five parameter family of multivariable Askey-Wilson polynomials are therefore used without further addressing this matter.

Notations and conventions: We write $\mathbb{N}=\{1,2,\dots\}$, $\mathbb{N}_0=\mathbb{N}\cup\{0\}$, $\mathbb{C}^*=\mathbb{C}\setminus\{0\}$ and $\mathbb{R}^*=\mathbb{R}\setminus\{0\}$. Empty sums are equal to 0, empty products are equal to 1. In order to keep the notations transparent, we will omit in formulas the dependance on parameters if it is clear from the context. In this paper n denotes the rank of the BC type root system (i.e. the multivariable orthogonal polynomials which we study in this paper depend on n variables $z=(z_1,\dots,z_n)$). We use the convention that a function $h(z)$ for which a definition with respect to the n variables $z=(z_1,\dots,z_n)$ is given, should be read with $n=m$ if it follows from the context that $z\in\mathbb{C}^m$. If $h(z)$ appears in formulas with $z\in\mathbb{C}^m$ and $m=0$, then $h(z)$ should be read as 1. Throughout this paper, we fix a $q\in(0,1)$.

2. Askey-Wilson polynomials for generic parameters values

We first introduce some notations. The q-shifted factorial is given by

$$(a;q)_b:=\frac{(a;q)_\infty}{(aq^b;q)_\infty},\quad (a;q)_\infty:=\prod_{j=0}^{\infty}\left(1-q^ja\right), \tag{2.1}$$

provided that $aq^b\notin\{q^{-k}\}_{k\in\mathbb{N}_0}$. For $b=k\in\mathbb{N}_0$, we have $(a;q)_k=\prod_{i=0}^{k-1}(1-aq^i)$, which is well defined for all $a\in\mathbb{C}$. We write furthermore

$$(a_1,\dots,a_m;q)_b:=\prod_{j=1}^{m}(a_j;q)_b \tag{2.2}$$

for products of q-shifted factorials.

Let S be the group of permutations of the set $\{1,\dots,n\}$ and $W=S\ltimes\{\pm1\}^n$ the Weyl group of type BC_n. Let $z_1,\dots,z_n$ be independent variables, then W acts in a natural way on the algebra $A:=\mathbf{C}[z_1^{\pm1},\dots,z_n^{\pm1}]$. We denote A^W for the subalgebra of W-invariant functions in A. A basis for A^W is given by the monomials $\{m_\lambda\,|\,\lambda\in\Lambda\}$, where $\Lambda:=\{\lambda\in\mathbb{N}_0^n\,|\,\lambda_1\geq\ldots\geq\lambda_n\}$, and

$$m_\lambda(z):=\sum_{\mu\in W\lambda}z^\mu$$

with $z^\mu=z_1^{\mu_1}\ldots z_n^{\mu_n}$. The W-orbit of $\lambda\in\Lambda\subset\mathbb{Z}^n$ is with respect to the natural action of W on $\mathbb{Z}^n$.

We write $\underline{t}=(t_0,t_1,t_2,t_3)$ for the four tuple of parameters t_0,t_1,t_2,t_3. We assume in this section that $\underline{t}\in V$, where $V\subset\mathbb{C}^4$ is the following parameter domain.

Definition 2.1. *Let V be the set of parameters $\underline{t}\in(\mathbb{C}^*)^4$ for which*

$$\#\{arg(t_i),arg(t_i^{-1})\,|\,i=0,1,2,3\}=8$$

and for which $t_0t_1t_2t_3\notin\mathbb{R}_{\geq1}$. Here $arg(u)\in[0,2\pi)$ is the argument of $u\in\mathbb{C}^*$ and $\mathbb{R}_{\geq1}:=\{r\in\mathbb{R}\,|\,r\geq1\}$.

For $\underline{t}\in V$ we define $\alpha_i^\pm=\alpha_i^\pm(\underline{t})$ by

$$\alpha_i^\pm:=\frac{\arg(t_i^{\pm1})}{2\pi},\qquad i\in\{0,1,2,3\}. \tag{2.3}$$

Note that $\alpha_i^\pm\neq0,1/2$ and that $\alpha_i^-=1-\alpha_i^+$ for all i.

The (in general complex) measure which we will introduce in this section is supported on a suitably deformed n-torus $C^n\subset\mathbb{C}^n$, where $C\subset\mathbb{C}$ is the following deformation of the unit circle T.

Definition 2.2. *We call a continuous rectifiable Jordan curve* $C = \phi_C([0,1]) \subset \mathbb{C}$ *a deformed circle if* C *has a parametrization* ϕ_C *of the form*

$$\phi_C(x) = r_C(x)e^{2\pi ix} \ (x \in [0,1]), \quad r_C : [0,1] \to (0,\infty) \tag{2.4}$$

and if C *is invariant under inversion, i.e.* $C^{-1} := \{z^{-1} \,|\, z \in C\} = C$. *For* $\underline{t} \in V$, *we call a deformed circle* C *a* $\underline{t}$*-contour if the four parameters* t_0, t_1, t_2, t_3 *are in the interior of* C.

For a deformed circle $C = \phi_C([0,1])$ the radial function r_C satisfies $r_C(1-x) = (r_C(x))^{-1}$ since $C = C^{-1}$. Since a deformed circle C is by definition a closed contour, we furthermore have that $r_C(0) = r_C(1/2) = r_C(1) = 1$. Note that the unit circle T is a deformed circle with $r_T \equiv 1$. If $\underline{t} \in V$ and C is a $\underline{t}$-contour, then the radial function r_C satisfies the extra conditions

$$r_C(\alpha_i^+) > |t_i|, \qquad i \in \{0, \ldots, 3\}$$

since t_i is in the interior of C for all i. In particular the unit circle T is a $\underline{t}$-contour if $|t_i| < 1$ for all $i \in \{0, \ldots, 3\}$. We will use the convention that a deformed circle C is counterclockwise oriented (i.e. has the orientation induced from the parametrization ϕ_C) when we integrate over C.

Let $t \in (0,1)$, $\underline{t} \in V$ and let C be a deformed circle such that $t_iq^j \notin C$ for $i \in \{0, \ldots, 3\}$ and $j \in \mathbb{N}_0$. Let $d\nu(z;\underline{t};t)$ be the measure on C^n given by

$$d\nu(z;\underline{t};t) := \Delta(z;\underline{t};t)\frac{dz}{z} \tag{2.5}$$

for $z \in C^n$ with $\frac{dz}{z} := \frac{dz_1}{z_1} \ldots \frac{dz_n}{z_n}$ and with weight function $\Delta(z;\underline{t};t)$ given by

$$\Delta(z;\underline{t};t) = \left(\prod_{j=1}^{n} w_c(z_j;\underline{t})\right) \delta(z;t), \tag{2.6}$$

with $w_c(x;\underline{t})$ given by

$$w_c(x;\underline{t}) := \frac{\left(x^2, x^{-2}; q\right)_\infty}{\left(t_0x, t_0x^{-1}, t_1x, t_1x^{-1}, t_2x, t_2x^{-1}, t_3x, t_3x^{-1}; q\right)_\infty} \tag{2.7}$$

and $\delta(z;t)$ given by

$$\delta(z;t) := \prod_{1\le i<j\le n} \left(z_iz_j, z_i^{-1}z_j, z_iz_j^{-1}, z_i^{-1}z_j^{-1}; q\right)_\tau, \quad t = q^\tau. \tag{2.8}$$

The factor $w_c(x;\underline{t})$ is exactly the weight function which occurs in the continuous part of the orthogonality measure for the one-variable Askey-Wilson polynomials [6]. The interaction factor $\delta(z;t)$ is only present in the multivariable setting (i.e. when $n > 1$), so in particular the measure is independent of the deformation parameter t when $n = 1$.

The measure $d\nu(.;\underline{t};t)$ on C^n is well defined, since the poles of $\Delta(.;\underline{t};t)$ do not lie on the integration domain C^n. Indeed, the poles of the weight function $\Delta(z;\underline{t};t)$ lie on hyperplanes

$$z_i = t_mq^j \ \text{ or } \ z_i = t_m^{-1}q^{-j} \tag{2.9}$$

with $m \in \{0, \ldots, 3\}$, $j \in \mathbb{N}_0$ and $i \in \{1, \ldots, n\}$ (the poles coming from $w_c(z_i)$) and on hypersurfaces

$$z_k^{\epsilon_k} z_l^{\epsilon_l} = t^{-1}q^{-j} \tag{2.10}$$

with $1 \leq k \neq l \leq n$, $j \in \mathbb{N}_0$ and $\epsilon_k, \epsilon_l \in \{-1, 1\}$ (the poles coming from $\delta(z; \underline{t})$). We have $z \notin C^n$ for a pole z of the form (2.9) since $C^{-1} = C$ and the assumption that $t_i q^j \notin C$ ($i \in \{0, 1, 2, 3\}, j \in \mathbb{N}_0$) and it follows from the definition of a deformed circle C that $z \notin C^n$ for a pole z of the form (2.10).

In this section we will study the orthogonal polynomials related to the complex measure $\big(C^n, d\nu(.; \underline{t}; t)\big)$ where C is an arbitrary $\underline{t}$-contour. We first show that the measure $d\nu(.; \underline{t}; t)$ is independent of the $\underline{t}$-contour C when integrating against W-invariant Laurent polynomials. In order to obtain this result, we first define specific subsets of $(\mathbb{C}^*)^n$ on which the interaction factor $\delta(.; t)$ is analytic.

Let C, $\mathfrak{C}$ be deformed circles, with parametrization given by $\phi_C(x) = r_C(x) e^{2\pi i x}$ respectively $\phi_{\mathfrak{C}}(x) = r_{\mathfrak{C}}(x) e^{2\pi i x}$. Let $A^+(C, \mathfrak{C})$ be the open subset

$$A^+(C, \mathfrak{C}) := \{x \in [0, 1] \,|\, r_C(x) > r_{\mathfrak{C}}(x)\} \subset (0, 1). \tag{2.11}$$

Set

$$\Omega(C, \mathfrak{C}) := \Omega^+(C, \mathfrak{C}) \cup \Omega^+(\mathfrak{C}, C) \cup C, \tag{2.12}$$

where $\Omega^+(C, \mathfrak{C})$ is given by

$$\Omega^+(C, \mathfrak{C}) := \bigcup_{x \in A^+(C, \mathfrak{C})} \{y(x) e^{2\pi i x} \,|\, r_C(x) \geq y(x) \geq r_{\mathfrak{C}}(x)\}. \tag{2.13}$$

The following properties of $\Omega(C, \mathfrak{C}) \subset \mathbb{C}^*$ follow easily from the definitions:
(i) $\Omega(C, \mathfrak{C}) = \Omega(\mathfrak{C}, C)$.
We will use, in view of *(i)*, the notation $\Omega = \Omega(C, \mathfrak{C})$ when it is clear from the context which pair of contours C, $\mathfrak{C}$ is meant.
(ii) $\Omega^{-1} = \Omega$.
(iii) The contour C can de deformed homotopically to $\mathfrak{C}$ within Ω.

We call $\Omega \subset \mathbb{C}^*$ *the domain associated with the pair* $(C, \mathfrak{C})$. We write $\mathcal{O}_W(\Omega^n)$ for the ring of W-invariant functions f which are analytic on Ω^n. We have now the following crucial lemma.

Lemma 2.3. *Let $t \in (0, 1)$ and let C, $\mathfrak{C}$ be deformed circles satisfying the condition $t r_C(x) < r_{\mathfrak{C}}(x)$ for all $x \in A^+(C, \mathfrak{C})$. Then $\delta(.; t) \in \mathcal{O}_W(\Omega^n)$.*

Proof. Let C, $\mathfrak{C}$ be deformed circles satisfying $t r_C(x) < r_{\mathfrak{C}}(x)$ for all $x \in A^+(C, \mathfrak{C})$. Let $z \in (\mathbb{C}^*)^n$ such that $z_k^{\epsilon_k} z_l^{\epsilon_l} = t^{-1} q^{-j}$ for some $j \in \mathbb{N}_0$, some $k \neq l$ and some $\epsilon_k, \epsilon_l \in \{\pm 1\}$. Write $\beta_k := \arg(z_k)/2\pi$ and $\beta_l := \arg(z_l)/2\pi$. For the proof of the lemma it suffices to show that either $z_k \notin \Omega$ or $z_l \notin \Omega$.

As an example, let us check that either $z_k \notin \Omega$ or $z_l \notin \Omega$ when $\beta_k \in A^+(C, \mathfrak{C})$ and $z_k z_l = t^{-1} q^{-j}$ for some $j \in \mathbb{N}_0$. We then have $\beta_k = 1 - \beta_l$ and $\beta_l \in A^+(\mathfrak{C}, C)$, so in particular $r_C(\beta_k) = r_C(\beta_l)^{-1}$, $r_{\mathfrak{C}}(\beta_k) = r_{\mathfrak{C}}(\beta_l)^{-1}$. Suppose that $z_l \in \Omega$, then

$$|z_k| = t^{-1} q^{-j} |z_l^{-1}| \geq q^{-j} t^{-1} r_{\mathfrak{C}}(\beta_k) > q^{-j} r_C(\beta_k) \geq r_C(\beta_k),$$

hence $z_k \notin \Omega$. All the other cases are checked similarly. □

Lemma 2.4. *Let $\underline{t} \in V$, $t \in (0, 1)$ and $f \in A^W$. Then*

$$\iint_{z \in C^n} f(z) d\nu(z; \underline{t}; t) \tag{2.14}$$

is independent of the choice of $\underline{t}$-contour C.

Proof. Write $N_f(C)$ for the integral (2.14). We have to show that $N_f(C) = N_f(\mathfrak{C})$ for arbitrary pairs of $\underline{t}$-contours $(C, \mathfrak{C})$.

Let $\mathcal{L}$ be the collection of pairs of $\underline{t}$-contours $(C, \mathfrak{C})$ for which $A^+(C, \mathfrak{C})$ is a finite disjoint union of open intervals and for which $tr_C(x) < r_{\mathfrak{C}}(x)$ for all $x \in A^+(C, \mathfrak{C})$. Fix a pair $(C, \mathfrak{C}) \in \mathcal{L}$ and let Ω be the associated domain. Since the four parameters t_0, t_1, t_2, t_3 are in the interior of C and $\mathfrak{C}$, we have $w_c(.; \underline{t}) \in \mathcal{O}_{\{\pm 1\}}(\Omega)$, and by Lemma 2.3 we have $\delta(.; t) \in \mathcal{O}_W(\Omega)$. So Cauchy's Theorem implies that $N_f(C) = N_f(\mathfrak{C})$.

Suppose now that $(C, \mathfrak{C})$ is an arbitrary pair of $\underline{t}$-contours. Then there exists a finite sequence of $\underline{t}$-contours $C_0, C_1, \ldots, C_s$ such that $C_0 = \mathfrak{C}$, $C_s = C$ and such that $(C_i, C_{i-1}) \in \mathcal{L}$ for all $i \in \{1, \ldots, s\}$. It follows that $N_f(C) = N_f(\mathfrak{C})$. $\square$

We define for parameters $\underline{t} \in V$ and $t \in (0,1)$ a symmetric bilinear form $\big(.,.\big)_{\underline{t},t}$ on A^W by

$$\big(f, g\big)_{\underline{t},t} := \frac{1}{(2\pi i)^n} \iint\limits_{z \in C^n} f(z) g(z) d\nu(z; \underline{t}; t), \quad f, g \in A^W \tag{2.15}$$

where C is an arbitrary $\underline{t}$-contour. The bilinear form (2.15) is independent of the choice of $\underline{t}$-contour C by Lemma 2.4. An important tool for studying orthogonal polynomials with respect to the bilinear form $\big(.,.\big)_{\underline{t},t}$ is an explicit second order q-difference operator $D = D_{\underline{t},t}$ which preserves the algebra A^W and which is symmetric with respect to the bilinear form $\big(.,.\big)_{\underline{t},t}$. The second order q-difference operator D was introduced by Koornwinder [24] and it is explicitly given by

$$D := \sum_{j=1}^{n} \left(\phi_j^+(z)(T_j^+ - \mathrm{Id}) + \phi_j^-(z)(T_j^- - \mathrm{Id}) \right), \tag{2.16}$$

where $T_j^{\pm}$ is the $q^{\pm 1}$-shift in the jth coordinate,

$$\left(T_j^{\pm} f\right)(z) := f(z_1, \ldots, z_{j-1}, q^{\pm 1} z_j, z_{j+1}, \ldots, z_n),$$

and the functions $\phi_j^+(z; \underline{t}; t)$ and $\phi_j^-(z; \underline{t}; t)$ are given by

$$\phi_j^+(z; \underline{t}; t) := \frac{\prod_{i=0}^{3}(1 - t_i z_j)}{(1 - z_j^2)(1 - q z_j^2)} \prod_{l \neq j} \frac{(1 - t z_l z_j)\left(1 - t z_l^{-1} z_j\right)}{(1 - z_l z_j)\left(1 - z_l^{-1} z_j\right)},$$

$$\phi_j^-(z; \underline{t}; t) := \phi_j^+(z^{-1}; \underline{t}; t),$$

where we have used the notation $z^{-1} = (z_1^{-1}, \ldots, z_n^{-1})$. The BC type dominance order on Λ is defined by

$$\mu \leq \lambda \quad \Leftrightarrow \quad \sum_{j=1}^{i} \mu_j \leq \sum_{j=1}^{i} \lambda_j \quad (i = 1, \ldots, n) \tag{2.17}$$

for $\lambda, \mu \in \Lambda$. Koornwinder proved the following triangularity property of D (see [24, Lemma 5.2] and the remark after [35, Proposition 4.1]).

Proposition 2.5. *Let $\lambda \in \Lambda$. For arbitrary $\underline{t} \in \mathbb{C}^4$ and $t \in \mathbb{C}$ we have*

$$Dm_\lambda = \sum_{\mu \leq \lambda} E_{\lambda,\mu} m_\mu \tag{2.18}$$

with $E_{\lambda,\mu}(\underline{t};t)\in\mathbb{C}$ *depending polynomially on* $\underline{t}$ *and* t*. The leading term* $E_{\lambda,\lambda}(\underline{t};t)$ *will be denoted by* $E_\lambda(\underline{t};t)$ *and is given by*

$$E_\lambda(\underline{t};t):=\sum_{j=1}^{n}\bigl(q^{-1}t_0t_1t_2t_3t^{2n-j-1}(q^{\lambda_j}-1)+t^{j-1}(q^{-\lambda_j}-1)\bigr). \tag{2.19}$$

In particular D maps A^W into itself. The other property of D which we already mentioned is the symmetry of D with respect to the bilinear form $\bigl(.,.\bigr)$, i.e.

$$\bigl(D_{\underline{t},t}f,g\bigr)_{\underline{t},t}=\bigl(f,D_{\underline{t},t}g\bigr)_{\underline{t},t},\quad f,g\in A^W \tag{2.20}$$

for parameters $\underline{t}\in V$ and $t\in(0,1)$. Koornwinder [24, Lemma 5.3] proved (2.20) for parameters $\underline{t}$ with $|t_i|<1$ (then the unit circle T can be chosen as $\underline{t}$-contour). By Proposition 2.5, (2.20) follows for $\underline{t}\in V$ by analytic continuation.

We define explicit expressions $\mathcal{N}(\lambda;\underline{t};t)$ for $\lambda\in\Lambda$ by

$$\mathcal{N}(\lambda;\underline{t};t):=2^nn!\mathcal{N}^+(\lambda;\underline{t};t)\mathcal{N}^-(\lambda;\underline{t};t) \tag{2.21}$$

where $\mathcal{N}^+(\lambda):=\mathcal{N}^+(\lambda;\underline{t};t)$ is given by

$$\begin{aligned}\mathcal{N}^+(\lambda):=&\prod_{i=1}^{n}\frac{\bigl(q^{2\lambda_i-1}t^{2(n-i)}t_0t_1t_2t_3;q\bigr)_\infty}{\bigl(q^{\lambda_i-1}t^{n-i}t_0t_1t_2t_3,q^{\lambda_i}t^{n-i}t_0t_1,q^{\lambda_i}t^{n-i}t_0t_2,q^{\lambda_i}t^{n-i}t_0t_3;q\bigr)_\infty}\\ &\cdot\prod_{1\le j<k\le n}\frac{\bigl(q^{\lambda_j+\lambda_k-1}t^{2n-j-k}t_0t_1t_2t_3,q^{\lambda_j-\lambda_k}t^{k-j};q\bigr)_\infty}{\bigl(q^{\lambda_j+\lambda_k-1}t^{2n-j-k+1}t_0t_1t_2t_3,q^{\lambda_j-\lambda_k}t^{k-j+1};q\bigr)_\infty},\end{aligned} \tag{2.22}$$

and $\mathcal{N}^-(\lambda):=\mathcal{N}^-(\lambda;\underline{t};t)$ is given by

$$\begin{aligned}\mathcal{N}^-(\lambda):=&\prod_{i=1}^{n}\frac{\bigl(q^{2\lambda_i}t^{2(n-i)}t_0t_1t_2t_3;q\bigr)_\infty}{\bigl(q^{\lambda_i+1}t^{n-i},q^{\lambda_i}t^{n-i}t_1t_2,q^{\lambda_i}t^{n-i}t_1t_3,q^{\lambda_i}t^{n-i}t_2t_3;q\bigr)_\infty}\\ &\cdot\prod_{1\le j<k\le n}\frac{\bigl(q^{\lambda_j+\lambda_k}t^{2n-j-k}t_0t_1t_2t_3,q^{\lambda_j-\lambda_k+1}t^{k-j};q\bigr)_\infty}{\bigl(q^{\lambda_j+\lambda_k}t^{2n-j-k-1}t_0t_1t_2t_3,q^{\lambda_j-\lambda_k+1}t^{k-j-1};q\bigr)_\infty}.\end{aligned} \tag{2.23}$$

The following theorem extends the results of Koornwinder in [24] (the orthogonality relations for the multivariable Askey-Wilson polynomials) and van Diejen in [12] (the quadratic norm evaluations for the multivariable Askey-Wilson polynomials) to parameters $\underline{t}\in V$ (in [24] and [12] the results were obtained for a parameter domain such that $|t_i|<1$ for all i).

Theorem 2.6. *Let* $\underline{t}\in V$ *and* $t\in(0,1)$*. There exists a unique basis* $\{P_\lambda(.;\underline{t};t)\}_{\lambda\in\Lambda}$ *of* A^W *such that*

$$P_\lambda(.;\underline{t};t)=m_\lambda+\sum_{\mu<\lambda}c_{\lambda,\mu}(\underline{t},t)m_\mu,\quad c_{\lambda,\mu}(\underline{t},t)\in\mathbb{C} \tag{2.24}$$

$$\bigl(P_\lambda(.;\underline{t};t),P_\mu(.;\underline{t};t)\bigr)_{\underline{t},t}=0\qquad \text{if }\ \mu\neq\lambda. \tag{2.25}$$

Furthermore, $P_\lambda(.;\underline{t};t)$ *is an eigenfunction of* $D_{\underline{t},t}$ *with eigenvalue* $E_\lambda(\underline{t};t)$ *and we have the explicit evaluation formula*

$$\bigl(P_\lambda(.;\underline{t};t),P_\lambda(.;\underline{t};t)\bigr)_{\underline{t},t}=\mathcal{N}(\lambda;\underline{t};t) \tag{2.26}$$

for the quadratic norms of the polynomials P_λ.

Definition 2.7. *We call $P_\lambda(.;\underline{t};t)$ the monic multivariable Askey-Wilson polynomial of degree λ.*

We end this section with a sketch of the proof for Theorem 2.6 using the techniques of Koornwinder [24] and van Diejen [12]. For more details, we refer the reader to these two papers.

We fix arbitrary $0 \neq \nu \in \Lambda$. It is sufficient to prove the existence and uniqueness of a set of W-invariant Laurent polynomials $\{P_\lambda(.;\underline{t};t)\}_{\lambda\leq\nu}$ satisfying (2.24) and (2.25) for $\lambda,\mu \leq \nu$ and to prove the remaining assertions of the theorem for the polynomials $\{P_\lambda(.;\underline{t};t)\}_{\lambda\leq\nu}$.

We first define the polynomials $\{P_\lambda\}_{\lambda\leq\nu}$ for a dense parameter domain $U_\nu \subset V\times(0,1)$. The subset U_ν is by definition the set of parameters $(\underline{t},t)\in V\times(0,1)$ such that $E_\mu(\underline{t};t)\neq E_\lambda(\underline{t};t)$ for all $\lambda,\mu\leq\nu$, $\lambda\neq\mu$. Note that $U_\nu\subset V\times(0,1)$ is open and dense since the eigenvalues $\{E_\lambda(\underline{t};t)\}_{\lambda\in\Lambda}$ are mutually different as polynomials in the parameters $\underline{t},t$.

The polynomials $P_\lambda(.;\underline{t};t)\in A^W$ for $(\underline{t},t)\in U_\nu$ and $\lambda\leq\nu$ are defined by

$$P_\lambda(.;\underline{t};t) := \left(\prod_{\mu<\lambda}\frac{D_{\underline{t},t}-E_\mu(\underline{t};t)}{E_\lambda(\underline{t};t)-E_\mu(\underline{t};t)}\right) m_\lambda \tag{2.27}$$

(cf. [25], [35]). By Proposition 2.5, $P_\lambda(.;\underline{t};t)$ is the unique eigenfunction of $D_{\underline{t},t}$ with eigenvalue $E_\lambda(\underline{t};t)$ which satisfies (2.24), and by the symmetry of D (2.20) we obtain the orthogonality relations (2.25) for the polynomials $\{P_\lambda(.;\underline{t};t)\}_{\lambda\leq\nu}$ and for parameters $(\underline{t},t)\in U_\nu$.

Next we establish the quadratic norm evaluations (2.26) for $\{P_\lambda(.;\underline{t};t)\}_{\lambda\leq\nu}$. In the special case $\lambda=0$, (2.26) reduces to

$$\begin{aligned}\big(1,1\big)_{\underline{t},t} &= \mathcal{N}(0;\underline{t};t)\\ &= 2^n n!\prod_{i=1}^n \frac{\big(t,t^{2n-i-1}t_0t_1t_2t_3;q\big)_\infty}{\big(q,t^{n-i+1};q\big)_\infty\prod_{0\leq j<k\leq 3}\big(t^{n-i}t_jt_k;q\big)_\infty}\end{aligned} \tag{2.28}$$

which was proved by Gustafson [17] for parameters $t\in(0,1)$ and $\underline{t}\in\mathbb{C}^4$ with $|t_i|<1$ (since then the torus T can be chosen as $\underline{t}$-contour). The second equality follows by a straightforward computation (see also [26]). By analytic continuation, (2.28) is valid for parameters $t\in(0,1)$ and $\underline{t}\in V$.

For general λ, van Diejen [12] proved explicit Pieri formulas for the renormalized Askey-Wilson polynomials

$$p_\lambda(.;\underline{t};t) := c(\lambda;\underline{t};t)P_\lambda(.;\underline{t};t),\quad c(\lambda;\underline{t};t) := \frac{\mathcal{N}^+(0)}{\mathcal{N}^+(\lambda)}\prod_{j=1}^n (t_0t^{n-j})^{\lambda_j}. \tag{2.29}$$

Note that the renormalization constant $c(\lambda;\underline{t};t)$ is a rational expression in the parameters $\underline{t},t$. The Pieri formulas for p_λ are explicit expressions for the coefficients $d_\lambda^{(r)}(\mu;\underline{t};t)$ in the expansions

$$E_r(z;\underline{t};t)p_\lambda(z;\underline{t};t) = \sum_{\mu\leq\lambda+\omega_n} d_\lambda^{(r)}(\mu;\underline{t};t)p_\mu(z;\underline{t};t),\quad (r=1,\ldots,n) \tag{2.30}$$

where $\{E_r(z;\underline{t};t)\}_{r=1}^n$ are explicit algebraic generators of the algebra of W-invariant Laurent polynomials A^W and where $\omega_n := (1,\ldots,1)\in\Lambda$ is the nth fundamental weight (see [12] for the explicit formulas, or [14, Appendix B] where the notations are closer to the ones used in this paper). Since everything in (2.30) depends rationally on the parameters $(\underline{t},t)$, we may view (2.30) as an identity in the algebra of W-invariant Laurent polynomials over the quotient field $\mathbb{C}(\underline{t},t)$, where $\underline{t},t$ are considered as indeterminates.

The Pieri formulas and the orthogonality relations for the renormalized Askey-Wilson polynomials with real parameters t_i and $|t_i|<1$ allowed van Diejen to reduce the the norm computation for arbitrary λ to the case $\lambda=0\in\Lambda$. Gustafson's evaluation (2.28) then completes the evaluation for general λ.

Exactly the same reduction can now be done for the norm evaluations of the polynomials $\{p_\lambda(.;\underline{t};t)\}_{\lambda\le\nu}$ for parameters $(\underline{t},t)\in U_\nu$. Indeed, by taking a dense subset of U_ν if necessary, we may assume that for all $(\underline{t},t)\in U_\nu$ the following conditions are fulfilled,
(i) the Askey-Wilson polynomials $P_\lambda(.;\underline{t};t)$ are well defined and mutually orthogonal with respect to $\big(.,.\big)_{\underline{t},t}$ for $\lambda\le\nu+\omega_n$,
(ii) the renormalization constants $c(\lambda;\underline{t};t)$ are well defined and non zero for $\lambda\le\nu+\omega_n$,
(iii) the Pieri formulas (2.30) are valid for all $\lambda\le\nu$.
The quadratic norm evaluations for the polynomials $\{p_\lambda(.;\underline{t};t)\}_{\lambda\le\nu}$ with parameter values $(\underline{t},t)\in U_\nu$ can then be reduced to the case $\lambda=0$ using exactly the same arguments as in [12, Theorem 4]. The extension of Gustafson's result (2.28) then completes the proof of (2.26) for $\{P_\lambda(.;\underline{t};t)\}_{\lambda\le\nu}$ and $(\underline{t},t)\in U_\nu$.

Now note that the functions

$$(\underline{t},t)\mapsto\mathcal{N}^{\pm}(\lambda;\underline{t};t):\quad V\times(0,1)\to\mathbb{C}\tag{2.31}$$

are well defined continuous functions which do not have zeros on the domain $V\times(0,1)$. This is immediately clear except for $\mathcal{N}^+(\lambda)$ with $\lambda\in\Lambda$ and $\lambda_n=0$. But then the expression for $\mathcal{N}^+(\lambda)$ can be simplified, similarly as the simplification of the expression for $\mathcal{N}(0)$ in (2.28), from which it follows that $\mathcal{N}^+(\lambda;\underline{t};t)$ is a well defined, continuous function of $(\underline{t},t)\in V\times(0,1)$ without zeros. It follows in particular that the quadratic norms of the polynomials $\{P_\lambda(.;\underline{t};t)\}_{\lambda\le\nu}$ are non zero for $(\underline{t},t)\in U_\nu$. Hence (2.24) and (2.25) for $\lambda,\mu\le\nu$ uniquely characterize the set of polynomials $\{P_\lambda(.;\underline{t};t)\}_{\lambda\le\nu}$ when $(\underline{t},t)\in U_\nu$.

It follows that the Askey-Wilson polynomial P_λ satisfies the following Gram-Schmidt formula,

$$P_\lambda(z;\underline{t};t)=m_\lambda(z)-\sum_{\mu<\lambda}\frac{\big(m_\lambda,P_\mu(.;\underline{t};t)\big)_{\underline{t},t}}{\mathcal{N}(\mu;\underline{t};t)}P_\mu(z;\underline{t};t)\tag{2.32}$$

for $(\underline{t},t)\in U_\nu$ and $\lambda\le\nu$. By induction, we conclude from (2.32) that the coefficients $c_{\lambda,\mu}:U_\nu\to\mathbb{C}$ in (2.24) uniquely extend to continuous functions $c_{\lambda,\mu}:V\times(0,1)\to\mathbb{C}$ for all $\mu<\lambda\le\nu$. (Compare with the proof of [14, Proposition 6.3].) Hence existence and uniqueness of $\{P_\lambda(.;\underline{t};t)\}_{\lambda\le\nu}$ as well as the other assertions follow now by continuity for all $(\underline{t},t)\in V\times(0,1)$. This completes the proof of the theorem.

Remark 2.8. *For $n=1$ the polynomials $\{P_\lambda(z;\underline{t})\,|\,\lambda\in\mathbb{N}_0\}$ are independent of t and are known as (monic, one-variable) Askey-Wilson polynomials. Theorem 2.6 reduces to the orthogonality relation and quadratic norm evaluation stated in* [6, Theorem 2.3]. *The polynomials $P_\lambda(z;\underline{t})$ $(\lambda\in\mathbb{N}_0)$ can then be given explicitly in* *terms of the basic hypergeometric series*

$$ {}_{s+1}\phi_s\left(\begin{matrix} a_1,\ldots,a_{s+1} \\ b_1,\ldots,b_s \end{matrix};q,z\right)=\sum_{m=0}^{\infty}\frac{(a_1,\ldots,a_{s+1};q)_m}{(b_1,\ldots,b_s,q;q)_m}z^m $$

as

$$ (2.33)\qquad P_\lambda(z;\underline{t})=\frac{(t_0t_1,t_0t_2,t_0t_3;q)_\lambda}{t_0^\lambda(t_0t_1t_2t_3q^{\lambda-1};q)_\lambda}\,{}_4\phi_3\left(\begin{matrix} q^{-\lambda},\ q^{\lambda-1}t_0t_1t_2t_3,\ t_0z,\ t_0z^{-1} \\ t_0t_1,\ t_0t_2,\ t_0t_3 \end{matrix};q,q\right) $$

(see [6] *for details). The renormalized Askey-Wilson polynomial* $p_\lambda(z;\underline{t})$ (2.29) *is then exactly the* ${}_4\phi_3$ *part of* (2.33).

The renormalization constant $c(\lambda;\underline{t};t)$ (2.29) is easily seen to be regular and non zero at $(\underline{t},t)\in V\times(0,1)$ for all $\lambda\in\Lambda$. Hence the renormalized Askey-Wilson polynomials $\{p_\lambda(z;\underline{t};t)\}_{\lambda\in\Lambda}$ form an orthogonal basis of A^W with respect to the bilinear form $\big(.,.\big)_{\underline{t},t}$ for all parameter values $(\underline{t},t)\in V\times(0,1)$.

3. Residue calculus for the orthogonality measure $d\nu$

In this section we develop for specific pairs of deformed circles $(C,\mathfrak{C})$ a residue calculus for integrals of the form

$$ (3.1)\qquad \frac{1}{(2\pi i)^n}\iint\limits_{z\in C^n} f(z)d\nu(z)=\frac{1}{(2\pi i)^n}\iint\limits_{z\in C^n} f(z)\Delta(z)\frac{dz}{z},\quad f\in\mathcal{O}_W(\Omega^n) $$

when C^n is shifted to $\mathfrak{C}^n$. Here $\Omega\subset\mathbb{C}^*$ is the domain associated with the pair $(C,\mathfrak{C})$. We will develop the residue calculus for pairs of contours $(C,\mathfrak{C})$ such that the poles only depend on q,t and one of the four parameters t_0,t_1,t_2,t_3. By the symmetry of $\Delta(z;\underline{t};t)$ in the parameters t_0,t_1,t_2,t_3, we may assume without loss of generality that the poles only depend on q,t and t_0. We use in this section the notations of Definition 2.2. So for a deformed circle C, we write $\phi_C(x)=r_C(x)e^{2\pi ix}$ for its parametrization.

We fix in this section $t\in(0,1)$ and $t_1,t_2,t_3\in\mathbb{C}^*$ such that $\#\{\alpha_i^+,\alpha_i^-\,|\,i=1,2,3\}=6$ ($\alpha_i^\pm$ given by (2.3)). We simplify notations by omiting the dependance on the parameters t_1,t_2,t_3 and t in this section. For instance, we will write $w_c(x;t_0)$ instead of $w_c(x;\underline{t})$, etc. In the next definition, we introduce the pairs of contours for which we will develop the residue calculus.

Definition 3.1. *Let* $t_0\in\mathbb{C}^*$ *such that* $\underline{t}=(t_0,t_1,t_2,t_3)\in V$ *(V given by Definition 2.1). A pair of contours* $(C,\mathfrak{C})$ *is called a* (n,t_0)*-residue pair if* C *and* $\mathfrak{C}$ *are deformed circles such that*
(i) *the subset* $A^+(C,\mathfrak{C})$ (2.11) *is an open interval for which* $\alpha_0^+\in A^+(C,\mathfrak{C})$ *but* $\alpha_i^\pm\notin A^+(C,\mathfrak{C})$ *(*$i=1,2,3$*);*
(ii) $t_iq^r\notin C\cup\mathfrak{C}$ *for* $r\in\mathbb{N}_0$ *and* $i\in\{0,\ldots,3\}$*;*
(iii) $t_0t^pq^r\notin\mathfrak{C}$ *for* $p\in\{-1,\ldots,n-1\}$ *and* $r\in\mathbb{Z}$.

Note that a (n,t_0)-residue pair $(C,\mathfrak{C})$ is a (r,t_0)-residue pair for all $r\in\mathbb{N}_0$ with $r\leq n$. We define now the measures $d\nu_r(z;t_0)$ $(r=1,\ldots,n)$ which will appear when the contour C^n in (3.1) is shifted to $\mathfrak{C}^n$. First we need to introduce some more notations.

We set

$$ (3.2)\qquad P(r):=\{\lambda\in\mathbb{N}_0^r\,|\,\lambda_1\leq\lambda_2\leq\ldots\leq\lambda_r\} $$

and we set $\lambda_0 := 0$ for arbitrary $\lambda \in P(r)$. We write $\rho_i = \rho_i(t_0;t) := t_0 t^{i-1}$ for $i \in \mathbb{Z}$ and, for $\lambda \in P(r)$,

$$\rho q^{\lambda} := (\rho_1 q^{\lambda_1}, \rho_2 q^{\lambda_2}, \ldots, \rho_r q^{\lambda_r}) = (t_0 q^{\lambda_1}, t_0 t q^{\lambda_2}, \ldots, t_0 t^{r-1} q^{\lambda_r}). \tag{3.3}$$

Define $D(r) = D(r; C, \mathfrak{C}; t_0)$ for $r = 1, \ldots, n$ by

$$D(r) := \{\rho q^{\lambda} \mid \lambda \in P(r) \text{ and } r_C(\alpha_0^+) > |\rho_i q^{\lambda_i}| > r_{\mathfrak{C}}(\alpha_0^+) \quad (i = 1, \ldots, r)\}. \tag{3.4}$$

Note that for $\omega \in D(r)$, we have $\omega_i \in \operatorname{int}(\Omega)$ for all i, where $\operatorname{int}(\Omega)$ is the interior of Ω. For $\rho q^{\lambda} \in D(r)$, we set

$$\Delta^{(d)}(\rho q^{\lambda}; t_0) := \left(\prod_{j=1}^{r} w_d\big(\rho_j q^{\lambda_j}; \rho_j q^{\lambda_{j-1}}\big)\right) \delta_d\big(\rho q^{\lambda}\big) \tag{3.5}$$

with

$$w_d(\rho_j q^{\lambda_j}; \rho_j q^{\lambda_{j-1}}) := \operatorname{res}_{x=\rho_j q^{\lambda_j}} \left(\frac{w_c(x; \rho_j q^{\lambda_{j-1}}, t_1, t_2, t_3)}{x}\right) \tag{3.6}$$

where w_c is given by (2.7) and with interaction factor

$$\delta_d(\rho q^{\lambda}) := \prod_{1 \le k < l \le r} \frac{\big(\rho_k^{-1}\rho_l q^{\lambda_l - \lambda_k}, \rho_k^{-1}\rho_l^{-1} q^{-\lambda_k - \lambda_l}; q\big)_{\tau}}{\big(\rho_k \rho_l q^{\lambda_{k-1}+\lambda_l}, \rho_k \rho_l^{-1} q^{\lambda_{k-1}-\lambda_l}; q\big)_{\lambda_k - \lambda_{k-1}}} \qquad (t = q^{\tau}). \tag{3.7}$$

The discrete parts of the measure which we will obtain by deforming C^n to $\mathfrak{C}^n$ in (3.1) will involve the weights $\Delta^{(d)}$. Note that for $r = 1$ and $\rho q^{\lambda} = t_0 q^i \in D(1)$, we have $\Delta^{(d)}(t_0 q^i; t_0) = w_d(t_0 q^i; t_0)$. Note furthermore that the weight function $w_c(x; \rho_j q^{\lambda_{j-1}})/x$ has a simple pole in $\rho_j q^{\lambda_j}$ since $\lambda_j - \lambda_{j-1} \in \mathbb{N}_0$ and $\underline{t} \in V$. In fact, for $\underline{\tau} = (\tau_0, \tau_1, \tau_2, \tau_3) \in V$ and for $i \in \mathbb{N}_0$, the discrete weight

$$w_d(\tau_0 q^i; \tau_0) = w_d\left(\tau_0 q^i; \tau_0; \tau_1, \tau_2, \tau_3\right) = \operatorname{res}_{x=\tau_0 q^i}\left(\frac{w_c(x; \underline{\tau})}{x}\right) \tag{3.8}$$

can be explicitly given by the formula

$$\begin{aligned} w_d(\tau_0 q^i; \tau_0) =& \frac{\big(\tau_0^{-2}; q\big)_{\infty}}{(q, \tau_0\tau_1, \tau_1/\tau_0, \tau_0\tau_2, \tau_2/\tau_0, \tau_0\tau_3, \tau_3/\tau_0; q)_{\infty}} \\ &. \frac{\big(\tau_0^2, \tau_0\tau_1, \tau_0\tau_2, \tau_0\tau_3; q\big)_i}{(q, \tau_0 q/\tau_1, \tau_0 q/\tau_2, \tau_0 q/\tau_3; q)_i} \frac{\big(1 - \tau_0^2 q^{2i}\big)}{(1 - \tau_0^2)} \left(\frac{q}{\tau_0\tau_1\tau_2\tau_3}\right)^{i} \end{aligned} \tag{3.9}$$

(see [6, Theorem 2.4] or [18, (7.5.22)] to avoid a small misprint). For $\rho q^{\lambda} \in D(r)$ and $z \in \mathfrak{C}^{n-r}$, we set

$$d\nu_r(\rho q^{\lambda}, z; t_0) = \Delta_r(\rho q^{\lambda}, z; t_0) \frac{dz}{z} \tag{3.10}$$

with weight function $\Delta_r(\rho q^{\lambda}, z; t_0)$ given by

$$\Delta_r(\rho q^{\lambda}, z; t_0) := \Delta^{(d)}\big(\rho q^{\lambda}; t_0\big) \Delta(z; t_0) \delta_c\big(\rho q^{\lambda}; z\big) \tag{3.11}$$

where $\Delta(z; t_0)$ is the weight function (2.6) in the variables $z = (z_1, \ldots, z_{n-r})$ and where $\delta_c(\rho q^{\lambda}; z)$ is an interaction factor given by

$$\delta_c(\rho q^{\lambda}; z) := \prod_{\substack{1 \le k \le r \\ 1 \le l \le n-r}} \big(\rho_k q^{\lambda_k} z_l, \rho_k q^{\lambda_k} z_l^{-1}, \rho_k^{-1} q^{-\lambda_k} z_l, \rho_k^{-1} q^{-\lambda_k} z_l^{-1}; q\big)_{\tau} \tag{3.12}$$

with $t = q^{\tau}$. In particular we have $\Delta_n(\rho q^{\lambda}; t_0) = \Delta^{(d)}(\rho q^{\lambda}; t_0)$ for $\rho q^{\lambda} \in D(n)$. The measure $d\nu_r(\rho q^{\lambda}, z; t_0)$ is well defined on $D(r) \times \mathfrak{C}^{n-r}$ since the denominator of

$\Delta_r(\rho q^\lambda, z; t_0)$ is non zero by properties **(ii)** and **(iii)** of the (n,t_0)-residue pair $(C,\mathfrak{C})$ (Definition 3.1). We call $d\nu_r$ the rth *measure associated with the* (n,t_0)*-residue pair* $(C,\mathfrak{C})$. We have the following proposition.

Proposition 3.2. *Let* $(C,\mathfrak{C})$ *be a* (n,t_0)*-residue pair and let* $\Omega=\Omega(C,\mathfrak{C})$ *be the associated domain. Let* $d\nu_r$ *be the* r*th measure associated with* $(C,\mathfrak{C})$*, then*

$$\begin{aligned}\frac{1}{(2\pi i)^n}\iint_{z\in C^n} f(z)d\nu(z) &= \frac{1}{(2\pi i)^n}\iint_{z\in\mathfrak{C}^n} f(z)d\nu(z)\\ &\quad+\sum_{r=1}^{n}\frac{2^r\big(n-r+1\big)_r}{(2\pi i)^{n-r}}\sum_{\omega\in D(r)}\iint_{z\in\mathfrak{C}^{n-r}} f(\omega,z)d\nu_r(\omega,z)\end{aligned}\tag{3.13}$$

for $f\in\mathcal{O}_W(\Omega^n)$ *where* $\big(u\big)_r:=\prod_{i=0}^{r-1}(u+i)$ *is the shifted factorial.*

In the next lemma we will give the proof of Proposition 3.2 for (n,t_0)-residue pairs $(C,\mathfrak{C})$ such that the interaction factor $\delta(.;t)$ is analytic on $\big(\Omega(C,\mathfrak{C})\big)^n$.

Lemma 3.3. *Suppose that* $(C,\mathfrak{C})$ *is a* (n,t_0)*-residue pair such that*

$$tr_C(x) < r_{\mathfrak{C}}(x), \qquad \forall x\in A^+(C,\mathfrak{C}).\tag{3.14}$$

Then (3.13) *is valid.*

Proof. Fix a (n,t_0)-residue pairs $(C,\mathfrak{C})$ satisfying the extra condition (3.14). We will prove by induction on $l\in\{0,\ldots,n\}$ that

$$\begin{aligned}\frac{1}{(2\pi i)^n}\iint_{z\in C^l\times\mathfrak{C}^{n-l}} f(z)\Delta(z;t_0)\frac{dz}{z} &=\frac{1}{(2\pi i)^n}\iint_{z\in\mathfrak{C}^n} f(z)\Delta(z;t_0)\frac{dz}{z}\\ &\quad+\frac{2l}{(2\pi i)^{n-1}}\sum_{i\in I}\iint_{z\in\mathfrak{C}^{n-1}} f(t_0q^i,z)\Delta_1(t_0q^i,z;t_0)\frac{dz}{z}\end{aligned}\tag{3.15}$$

for $f\in\mathcal{O}_W(\Omega^n)$, where

$$I=\{i\in\mathbb{N}_0\,|\,r_C(\alpha_0^+)>|t_0q^i|>r_{\mathfrak{C}}(\alpha_0^+)\}.\tag{3.16}$$

Then (3.13) is the special case $l=n$ in (3.15), since $D(r)=\emptyset$ for $r>1$ by (3.14).

For $l=0$, (3.15) is trivial. Let $l\in\{1,\ldots,n\}$. Since $\delta(.;t)\in\mathcal{O}_W(\Omega^n)$ by Lemma 2.3, we can shift C to $\mathfrak{C}$ for the first variable z_1 in (3.1) and we obtain by (3.8), by the W-invariance of $\Delta(z)$ and by Cauchy's Theorem for $f\in\mathcal{O}_W(\Omega^n)$,

$$\begin{aligned}\frac{1}{(2\pi i)^n}\iint_{z\in C^l\times\mathfrak{C}^{n-l}} f(z)\Delta(z;t_0)\frac{dz}{z} &= \frac{1}{(2\pi i)^n}\iint_{z\in C^{l-1}\times\mathfrak{C}^{n-l+1}} f(z)\Delta(z;t_0)\frac{dz}{z}\\ &\quad+\frac{2}{(2\pi i)^{n-1}}\sum_{i\in I}\iint_{z\in C^{l-1}\times\mathfrak{C}^{n-l}} f(t_0q^i,z)\Delta_1(t_0q^i,z;t_0)\frac{dz}{z}.\end{aligned}\tag{3.17}$$

Here we have used that the residue at $z_1=t_0^{-1}q^{-i}$ $(i\in I)$ of $\Delta(z_1,z';t_0)/z_1$ is equal to $-\Delta_1(t_0q^i,z';t_0)$ since

$$\operatorname{res}_{x=t_0^{-1}q^{-i}}\left(\frac{w_c(x;\underline{t})}{x}\right)=-w_d(t_0q^i;t_0;t_1,t_2,t_3).$$

The weight function $\Delta_1(t_0q^i,z;t_0)$ in (3.17) can be rewritten as

$$\Delta_1(t_0q^i,z;t_0)=h(t_0q^i,z;t_0)\Delta(z;tt_0q^i)\tag{3.18}$$

with

$$h(t_0q^i,z;t_0)=w_d(t_0q^i;t_0)\prod_{s=1}^{n-1}\frac{\big(t_0^{-1}q^{-i}z_s,t_0^{-1}q^{-i}z_s^{-1};q\big)_\tau}{\big(t_0z_s,t_0z_s^{-1};q\big)_i}\quad (t=q^\tau). \tag{3.19}$$

This follows by interchanging the factor $\big(t_0z_s,t_0z_s^{-1};q\big)_\infty$ in the denominator of $w_c(z_s;t_0)$ with the factor $\big(tt_0q^iz_s,tt_0q^iz_s^{-1};q\big)_\infty$ in the denominator of $\delta_c(t_0q^i;z)$ for $s=1,\ldots,n-1$. We have $\Delta(.;tt_0q^i)\in\mathcal{O}_W(\Omega^{n-1})$ for $i\in I$ by (3.14) and Lemma 2.3. We claim that $h(t_0q^i,.;t_0)\in\mathcal{O}_W(\Omega^{n-1})$ for $i\in I$. Indeed, it is sufficient to check that the map

$$x\mapsto\frac{\big(t_0^{-1}q^{-i}x,t_0^{-1}q^{-i}x^{-1};q\big)_\infty}{\big(t_0x,t_0x^{-1};q\big)_i\big(tt_0^{-1}q^{-i}x,tt_0^{-1}q^{-i}x^{-1};q\big)_\infty} \tag{3.20}$$

is analytic on Ω when $i\in I$. The zeros of the factor $\big(t_0x,t_0x^{-1};q\big)_i$ in the denominator are compensated by zeros in the numerator. Next, we check that $\big(tt_0^{-1}q^{-i}x;q\big)_\infty$ is non zero for $x\in\Omega$ and $i\in I$. Now we have that $\big(tt_0^{-1}q^{-i}x;q\big)_\infty=0$ iff $x=t^{-1}q^{i-m}t_0$ for some $m\in\mathbb{N}_0$. In particular, we must have $\arg(x)=\arg(t_0)=2\pi\alpha_0^+$. Since $i\in I$, we have for $m\in\mathbb{N}_0$,

$$|t^{-1}q^{i-m}t_0|>t^{-1}r_{\mathfrak{C}}(\alpha_0^+)q^{-m}\geq t^{-1}r_{\mathfrak{C}}(\alpha_0^+)>r_C(\alpha_0^+),$$

where the last inequality is obtained from the extra condition (3.14). Since $x\in\Omega$ with $\arg(x)=2\pi\alpha_0^+$ implies that $r_{\mathfrak{C}}(\alpha_0^+)\leq|x|\leq r_C(\alpha_0^+)$, we conclude that $\big(tt_0^{-1}q^{-i}x;q\big)_\infty\neq 0$ for $x\in\Omega$ and $i\in I$. Since $\Omega^{-1}=\Omega$, we then also have $\big(tt_0^{-1}q^{-i}x^{-1};q\big)_\infty\neq 0$ for $x\in\Omega$ and $i\in I$. Thus the map given by (3.20) is analytic on Ω if $i\in I$. In particular,

$$f(t_0q^i,.)\Delta_1(t_0q^i,.;t_0)\in\mathcal{O}_W(\Omega^{n-1})$$

for $i\in I$, so we obtain by Cauchy's Theorem and (3.17),

$$\begin{aligned}\frac{1}{(2\pi i)^n}\iint_{z\in C^l\times\mathfrak{C}^{n-l}}f(z)\Delta(z;t_0)\frac{dz}{z}&=\frac{1}{(2\pi i)^n}\iint_{z\in C^{l-1}\times\mathfrak{C}^{n-l+1}}f(z)\Delta(z;t_0)\frac{dz}{z}\\&+\frac{2}{(2\pi i)^{n-1}}\sum_{i\in I}\iint_{z\in\mathfrak{C}^{n-1}}f(t_0q^i,z)\Delta_1(t_0q^i,z;t_0)\frac{dz}{z}\end{aligned} \tag{3.21}$$

for $f\in\mathcal{O}_W(\Omega^n)$. Then (3.15) follows by applying the induction hypotheses on the integral over $C^{l-1}\times\mathfrak{C}^{n-l+1}$ in (3.21). □

Lemma 3.3 can be used to prove Proposition 3.2 inductively. The following definition will be used to formulate the induction hypotheses.

Definition 3.4. *Let $(C,\mathfrak{C})$ be a (n,t_0)-residue pair and let $A^+(C,\mathfrak{C})$ (2.11) be the associated open interval. A sequence of closed contours $(C_0,\ldots,C_s)$ is called a (n,t_0)-resolution for $(C,\mathfrak{C})$ if the contours C_l are deformed circles satisfying the following four conditions (we write r_l for the (radial) functions r_{C_l} in the parametrization ϕ_{C_l} of C_l):*
(i) *$C_0=\mathfrak{C}$ and $C_s=C$;*
(ii) *$r_l(x)=r_{\mathfrak{C}}(x)=r_C(x)$ for $x\notin A^+(C,\mathfrak{C})\cup A^+(\mathfrak{C},C)$ and $l\in\{0,\ldots,s\}$;*
(iii) *$tr_{l+1}(x)<r_l(x)<r_{l+1}(x)$ for $x\in A^+(C,\mathfrak{C})$ and $l\in\{0,\ldots,s-1\}$;*
(iv) *$t_0t^pq^r\notin C_l$ for $p\in\{-1,\ldots,n-1\}$, $r\in\mathbb{Z}$ and $l\in\{1,\ldots,s-1\}$.*

We call s the length of the resolution.

Note that there exists a (n,t_0)-resolution for every (n,t_0)-residue pair $(C,\mathfrak{C})$. If $(C_0,\ldots,C_s)$ is a (n,t_0)-resolution for a (n,t_0)-residue pair $(C,\mathfrak{C})$, then (C_l,C_{l-1}) is a (n,t_0)-residue pair satisfying the extra condition (3.14) used to prove Lemma 3.3 ($l\in\{1,\ldots,s\}$). We will prove now Proposition 3.2 by induction on the length of the resolution.

Proof of Proposition 3.2. Suppose that for all $n\in\mathbb{N}$ and all $t_0\in\mathbb{C}^*$ with $\underline{t}=(t_0,t_1,t_2,t_3)\in V$, Proposition 3.2 has been proved for (n,t_0)-residue pairs which have a (n,t_0)-resolution of length $\leq s-1$, where $s\geq 2$.

Fix arbitrary $n\in\mathbb{N}$ and $t_0\in\mathbb{C}^*$ such that $\underline{t}=(t_0,t_1,t_2,t_3)\in V$. The proposition is clear for $n=1$, so we may assume that $n>1$. Let $(C,\mathfrak{C})$ be a (n,t_0)-residue pair with a (n,t_0)-resolution $(C_0,\ldots,C_s)$ of length s. It suffices to prove (3.13) for the (n,t_0)-residue pair $(C,\mathfrak{C})$. We write $\Omega^{(l)}$ and $\Omega_{(l)}$ for the domains associated with the (n,t_0)-residue pairs (C_l,C_{l-1}) and $(C_l,\mathfrak{C})$ respectively ($l\in\{1,\ldots,s\}$). Note that $\Omega_{(1)}\subset\Omega_{(2)}\subset\ldots\subset\Omega_{(s)}=\Omega$ where Ω is the domain associated with the (n,t_0)-residue pair $(C,\mathfrak{C})$. By (3.15) and (3.18), we have

$$\begin{aligned}\frac{1}{(2\pi i)^n}\iint\limits_{z\in C^n} f(z)\Delta(z;t_0)\frac{dz}{z} =&\frac{1}{(2\pi i)^n}\iint\limits_{z\in(C_{s-1})^n} f(z)\Delta(z;t_0)\frac{dz}{z}\\ &+\frac{2n}{(2\pi i)^{n-1}}\sum_{i\in I_s}\iint\limits_{z\in(C_{s-1})^{n-1}} f_i(z)\Delta(z;tt_0q^i)\frac{dz}{z}\end{aligned}\tag{3.22}$$

for $f\in\mathcal{O}_W(\Omega^n)$, where

$$I_s:=\{i\in\mathbb{N}_0\,|\,r_s(\alpha_0^+)>|t_0q^i|>r_{s-1}(\alpha_0^+)\}\tag{3.23}$$

and $f_i(z):=f(t_0q^i,z)h(t_0q^i,z;t_0)$ with h given by (3.19). We will apply the induction hypotheses on all the terms in the right hand side of (3.22). For the integral over $\bigl(C_{s-1}\bigr)^n$ note that $(C_0,\ldots,C_{s-1})$ is a (n,t_0)-resolution of length $s-1$ for the (n,t_0)-residue pair $(C_{s-1},\mathfrak{C})$. Hence, by the induction hypotheses,

$$\begin{aligned}\frac{1}{(2\pi i)^n}\iint\limits_{z\in(C_{s-1})^n} f(z)\Delta(z;t_0)\frac{dz}{z}=&\frac{1}{(2\pi i)^n}\iint\limits_{z\in\mathfrak{C}^n} f(z)\Delta(z;t_0)\frac{dz}{z}\\ &+\sum_{r=1}^n\frac{2^r\bigl(n-r+1\bigr)_r}{(2\pi i)^{n-r}}\sum_{\omega\in D(r;C_{s-1},\mathfrak{C};t_0)}\iint\limits_{z\in\mathfrak{C}^{n-r}} f(\omega,z)\Delta_r(\omega,z;t_0)\frac{dz}{z}\end{aligned}\tag{3.24}$$

for all $f\in\mathcal{O}_W(\Omega^n)$.

Now fix an $i\in I_s$. We have seen in the proof of Lemma 3.3 that $h(t_0q^i,.;t_0)\in\mathcal{O}_W((\Omega^{(s)})^{n-1})$. In fact it follows from the proof that $h(t_0q^i,.;t_0)\in\mathcal{O}_W(\Omega^{n-1})$. In particular we have $f_i\in\mathcal{O}_W((\Omega_{(s-1)})^{n-1})$ for $f\in\mathcal{O}_W(\Omega^n)$. Furthermore we have that $(tt_0t^i,t_1,t_2,t_3)\in V$ since $\arg(tt_0t^i)=\arg(t_0)$ and that $(C_0,\ldots,C_{s-1})$ is a $(n-1,tt_0q^i)$-resolution of length $s-1$ for the $(n-1,tt_0q^i)$-residue pair $(C_{s-1},\mathfrak{C})$. So we can apply the induction hypotheses for all the terms in the second line of

(3.22), and we obtain

(3.25)
$$\begin{aligned}\frac{2n}{(2\pi i)^{n-1}}\iint_{z\in(C_{s-1})^{n-1}} f_i(z)\Delta(z;tt_0q^i)\frac{dz}{z} &= \frac{2n}{(2\pi i)^{n-1}}\iint_{z\in\mathfrak{C}^{n-1}} f_i(z)\Delta(z;tt_0q^i)\frac{dz}{z}\\ &+\sum_{r=2}^{n}\frac{2^r\big(n-r+1\big)_r}{(2\pi i)^{n-r}}\sum_{\omega\in D(r-1;C_{s-1},\mathfrak{C};tt_0q^i)}\iint_{z\in\mathfrak{C}^{n-r}} f_i(\omega,z)\Delta_{r-1}(\omega,z;tt_0q^i)\frac{dz}{z}\end{aligned}$$

for $f\in\mathcal{O}_W(\Omega^n)$ and $i\in I_s$.

Substitution of (3.24) and (3.25) in the right hand side of (3.22) completes the proof of (3.13), since

$$\begin{aligned}D(1;C,\mathfrak{C};t_0)&=D(1;C_{s-1},\mathfrak{C};t_0)\cup\{t_0q^i\}_{i\in I_s},\\ D(r;C,\mathfrak{C};t_0)&=D(r;C_{s-1},\mathfrak{C};t_0)\cup\bigcup_{i\in I_s}\big\{(t_0q^i,\omega)\,|\,\omega\in D(r-1;C_{s-1},\mathfrak{C};tt_0q^i)\big\}\end{aligned}$$

disjoint unions ($r\in\{2,\ldots,n\}$) and

$$\begin{aligned}f_i(z)\Delta(z;tt_0q^i)&=f(t_0q^i,z)\Delta_1(t_0q^i,z;t_0),\\ f_i(\omega,z)\Delta_{r-1}(\omega,z;tt_0q^i)&=f(t_0q^i,\omega,z)\Delta_r(t_0q^i,\omega,z;t_0)\end{aligned}\tag{3.26}$$

for $i\in I_s$, $r\in\{2,\ldots,n\}$ and $\omega\in D(r-1;C_{s-1},\mathfrak{C};tt_0q^i)$ (recall the notational convention which implies that the $\Delta(z;tt_0q^i)$ respectively $\Delta_{r-1}(\omega,z;tt_0q^i)$ in the left hand side of (3.26) is with respect to $n-1$ variables z respectively (ω,z), while the $\Delta_1(t_0q^i,z;t_0)$ respectively $\Delta_r(t_0q^i,\omega,z;t_0)$ in the right hand side of (3.26) is with respect to n variables (t_0q^i,z) respectively (t_0q^i,ω,z)). ☐

4. Limit transition to q-Racah polynomials

In this section we will show that the orthogonality relations and norm evaluations for the multivariable q-Racah polynomials can be obtained by applying the residue calculus of the previous section to the results in Theorem 2.6. The multivariable q-Racah polynomials are orthogonal with respect to a finite, discrete measure and were previously studied in [14].

For $\lambda\in P(r)$ we set

$$\begin{aligned}\Delta^{qR}\big(\rho q^\lambda;\underline{t};t\big):=&\prod_{i=1}^{r}\left(\frac{\big(q\rho_i^2;q\big)_{2\lambda_i}}{\big(\rho_i^2;q\big)_{2\lambda_i}(q^{-1}t_0t_1t_2t_3t^{2i-2})^{\lambda_i}}\prod_{j=0}^{3}\frac{\big(t_j\rho_i;q\big)_{\lambda_i}}{\big(qt_j^{-1}\rho_i;q\big)_{\lambda_i}}\right)\\ &\cdot\prod_{1\le k<l\le r}\frac{\big(q\rho_k\rho_l,t\rho_k\rho_l;q\big)_{\lambda_k+\lambda_l}\big(q\rho_k^{-1}\rho_l,t\rho_k^{-1}\rho_l;q\big)_{\lambda_l-\lambda_k}}{\big(t^{-1}q\rho_k\rho_l,\rho_k\rho_l;q\big)_{\lambda_k+\lambda_l}\big(t^{-1}q\rho_k^{-1}\rho_l,\rho_k^{-1}\rho_l;q\big)_{\lambda_l-\lambda_k}}\end{aligned}\tag{4.1}$$

where $\rho_i := t_0 t^{i-1}$ and we set for $r \in \mathbb{N}_0$,

$$\begin{aligned} K_r(\underline{t};t) :=& \prod_{i=1}^{r} \frac{\big(\rho_i^{-2};q\big)_\infty}{\big(q,\rho_i t_1,\rho_i^{-1}t_1,\rho_i t_2,\rho_i^{-1}t_2,\rho_i t_3,\rho_i^{-1}t_3;q\big)_\infty} \\ &\cdot \prod_{1\le k<l\le r} \big(\rho_k^{-1}\rho_l,\rho_k^{-1}\rho_l^{-1};q\big)_\tau \\ =& \prod_{i=1}^{r} \frac{\big(\rho_i^{-2},t,t_0^{-2}t^{2-i-r};q\big)_\infty}{\big(q,\rho_i t_1,\rho_i^{-1}t_1,\rho_i t_2,\rho_i^{-1}t_2,\rho_i t_3,\rho_i^{-1}t_3,t^i,t_0^{-2}t^{2-2i};q\big)_\infty} \end{aligned} \tag{4.2}$$

where $t = q^\tau$. The discrete weights $\Delta^{(d)}(\rho q^\lambda;\underline{t};t)$ (3.5) can now be rewritten as follows.

Proposition 4.1. *For $\lambda \in P(r)$ we have*

$$\Delta^{(d)}(\rho q^\lambda;\underline{t};t) = K_r(\underline{t};t)\Delta^{qR}(\rho q^\lambda;\underline{t};t),$$

where $\rho_i = t_0 t^{i-1}$.

Proof. We rewrite the discrete weight $\Delta^{(d)}(\rho q^\lambda;\underline{t};t)$ using the following method. If we meet in the explicit expression for the discrete weight $\Delta^{(d)}(\rho q^\lambda;\underline{t};t)$ a q-shifted factorial of the form $\big(aq^m;q\big)_b$ with $m \in \mathbb{N}_0$ depending only on λ, we first rewrite this as a quotient of infinite products using (2.1). Then we replace the factors of the form $\big(cq^m;q\big)_\infty$ by $\big(c;q\big)_\infty\big(c;q\big)_m^{-1}$ if $m \in \mathbb{N}_0$, respectively by $\big(c;q\big)_\infty(-c)^{-m}q^{-\binom{1-m}{2}}\big(qc^{-1};q\big)_{-m}$ if $m \in -\mathbb{N}$. For the case $m \in -\mathbb{N}$, we used here the formula

$$\big(q^{1-l}x;q\big)_l = (-x)^l q^{-\binom{l}{2}}\big(x^{-1};q\big)_l, \quad (l \in \mathbb{N}). \tag{4.3}$$

Using this method we obtain for $j \in \{1,\ldots,r\}$,

$$\begin{aligned} &\prod_{i=1}^{j-1} \frac{1}{\big(\rho_i\rho_j q^{\lambda_{i-1}+\lambda_j},\rho_i\rho_j^{-1}q^{\lambda_{i-1}-\lambda_j};q\big)_{\lambda_i-\lambda_{i-1}}} \\ &\quad = (-1)^{\lambda_{j-1}} t^{(j-1)\lambda_j} q^{\lambda_{j-1}-\binom{\lambda_j-\lambda_{j-1}}{2}+\binom{\lambda_j}{2}} \frac{\big(q;q\big)_{\lambda_j-\lambda_{j-1}}\big(t_0\rho_j;q\big)_{\lambda_j}}{\big(\rho_j^2;q\big)_{\lambda_j+\lambda_{j-1}}\big(qt_0^{-1}\rho_j;q\big)_{\lambda_j}} \\ &\quad\quad \cdot \prod_{i=1}^{j-1} \frac{\big(t\rho_i\rho_j;q\big)_{\lambda_i+\lambda_j}\big(q\rho_i^{-1}\rho_j;q\big)_{\lambda_j-\lambda_i}}{\big(\rho_i\rho_j;q\big)_{\lambda_i+\lambda_j}\big(qt^{-1}\rho_i^{-1}\rho_j;q\big)_{\lambda_j-\lambda_i}} t^{\lambda_i-\lambda_j}. \end{aligned} \tag{4.4}$$

Using (4.4) and applying the same method to the explicit expression for the weight w_d (3.9) gives

$$
\begin{aligned}
w_d(\rho_j q^{\lambda_j};\rho_j q^{\lambda_{j-1}})&\prod_{i=1}^{j-1}\frac{1}{\big(\rho_i\rho_j q^{\lambda_{i-1}+\lambda_j},\rho_i\rho_j^{-1}q^{\lambda_{i-1}-\lambda_j};q\big)_{\lambda_i-\lambda_{i-1}}}\\
&=\frac{\big(\rho_j^{-2};q\big)_\infty}{\big(q,\rho_jt_1,\rho_j^{-1}t_1,\rho_jt_2,\rho_j^{-1}t_2,\rho_jt_3,\rho_j^{-1}t_3;q\big)_\infty}\\
&\cdot\frac{\big(q\rho_j^2;q\big)_{2\lambda_j}}{\big(\rho_j^2;q\big)_{2\lambda_j}(q^{-1}t_0t_1t_2t_3)^{\lambda_j}}\prod_{k=0}^{3}\frac{\big(t_k\rho_j;q\big)_{\lambda_j}}{\big(qt_k^{-1}\rho_j;q\big)_{\lambda_j}}\\
&\cdot\prod_{i=1}^{j-1}\frac{\big(t\rho_i\rho_j;q\big)_{\lambda_i+\lambda_j}\big(q\rho_i^{-1}\rho_j;q\big)_{\lambda_j-\lambda_i}}{\big(\rho_i\rho_j;q\big)_{\lambda_i+\lambda_j}\big(qt^{-1}\rho_i^{-1}\rho_j;q\big)_{\lambda_j-\lambda_i}}t^{\lambda_i-\lambda_j}
\end{aligned}
\tag{4.5}
$$

for $j\in\{1,\ldots,r\}$. Now again applying the above mentioned method, one obtains

$$
\begin{aligned}
&\prod_{i=1}^{j-1}\big(\rho_i^{-1}\rho_j q^{\lambda_j-\lambda_i},\rho_i^{-1}\rho_j^{-1}q^{-\lambda_i-\lambda_j};q\big)_\tau\\
&\quad=\prod_{i=1}^{j-1}\big(\rho_i^{-1}\rho_j,\rho_i^{-1}\rho_j^{-1};q\big)_\tau\frac{\big(t\rho_i^{-1}\rho_j;q\big)_{\lambda_j-\lambda_i}\big(q\rho_i\rho_j;q\big)_{\lambda_i+\lambda_j}}{\big(\rho_i^{-1}\rho_j;q\big)_{\lambda_j-\lambda_i}\big(qt^{-1}\rho_i\rho_j;q\big)_{\lambda_i+\lambda_j}}t^{-\lambda_i-\lambda_j}
\end{aligned}
\tag{4.6}
$$

for $j\in\{1,\ldots,r\}$, where $t=q^\tau$. Now the proposition follows by multiplying (4.5) and (4.6) and taking the product over $j\in\{1,\ldots,r\}$. $\square$

In the next theorem we give orthogonality relations for the Askey-Wilson polynomials when the parameters $\underline{t}$ satisfy the truncation condition $t^{n-1}t_0t_3=q^{-N}$. We will formulate the theorem with the parameters considered as indeterminates. Set $F:=\mathbb{C}(\underline{t},t)$, $\mathbb{F}:=\mathbb{C}(t_0,t_1,t_2,t)$ and $\underline{t}_N:=(t_0,t_1,t_2,t^{1-n}t_0^{-1}q^{-N})$. Let A_F^W respectively $A_{\mathbb{F}}^W$ be the algebra of W-invariant Laurent polynomials over the field F respectively $\mathbb{F}$. We define the *Askey-Wilson polynomial* $P_\lambda(.;\underline{t};t)\in A_F^W$ over the field F as

$$
P_\lambda(.;\underline{t};t):=\left(\prod_{\mu<\lambda}\frac{D_{\underline{t},t}-E_\mu(\underline{t},t)}{E_\lambda(\underline{t},t)-E_\mu(\underline{t};t)}\right)m_\lambda. \tag{4.7}
$$

By specializing the parameters $(\underline{t},t)$ to values in $V\times(0,1)$, we obtain the monic multivariable Askey-Wilson polynomial $P_\lambda(.;\underline{t};t)\in A^W$ of degree λ as defined in Theorem 2.6 (see Definition 2.7).

Note that $P_\lambda(.;\underline{t}_N;t)\in A_{\mathbb{F}}^W$ is well defined since the eigenvalues $\{E(\lambda;\underline{t}_N;t)\}_{\lambda\in\Lambda}$ (2.19) are mutually different as elements in $\mathbb{C}[t_0,t_1,t_2,t]$.

Definition 4.2. *We call* $\{P_\lambda(.;\underline{t}_N;t)\}_{\lambda\in\Lambda_N}\subset A_{\mathbb{F}}^W$ *with* $\Lambda_N:=\{\lambda\in\Lambda\mid\lambda_1\leq N\}$ *the family of multivariable (BC type) q-Racah polynomials.*

Let $\lambda\in P(n)$, then the weight $\Delta^{qR}(\rho q^\lambda;\underline{t}_N;t)\in\mathbb{F}$ is well defined (Δ^{qR} given by (4.1)) and it is non zero if and only if $\lambda_n\leq N$ due to the factor $\big(\rho_nt_3;q\big)_{\lambda_n}$ in the numerator of $\Delta^{qR}(\rho q^\lambda;\underline{t};t)$. So the bilinear form

$$
\langle f,g\rangle_{qR,\underline{t}_N,t}:=\sum_{\lambda\in P(n)}f(\rho q^\lambda)g(\rho q^\lambda)\Delta^{qR}(\rho q^\lambda;\underline{t}_N;t),\quad f,g\in A_{\mathbb{F}}^W, \tag{4.8}
$$

takes its values in the field $\mathbb{F}$. Let $\mathcal{N}^{qR}(\lambda;\underline{t};t)$ for $\lambda\in\Lambda$ be given by

$$\mathcal{N}^{qR}(\lambda;\underline{t};t):=\frac{\mathcal{N}(\lambda;\underline{t};t)}{K_n(\underline{t};t)2^n n!} \tag{4.9}$$

where $\mathcal{N}(\lambda)$ (2.21) is the expression for the quadratic norms of the Askey-Wilson polynomial P_λ. Substitution of the explicit expressions for $\mathcal{N}(\lambda)$ and K_n in (4.9) yields that $\mathcal{N}^{qR}(\lambda;\underline{t}_N;t)\in\mathbb{F}$ and that $\mathcal{N}^{qR}(\lambda;\underline{t}_N;t)$ is non zero if and only if $\lambda\in\Lambda_N$. We have now the following theorem.

Theorem 4.3. *Let $N\in\mathbb{N}$. The q-Racah polynomials $P_\lambda(.;\underline{t}_N;t)$ ($\lambda\in\Lambda_N$) are orthogonal with respect to $\langle .,.\rangle_{qR,\underline{t}_N,t}$ and the quadratic norms are given by*

$$\langle P_\lambda(.;\underline{t}_N;t),P_\lambda(.;\underline{t}_N;t)\rangle_{qR,\underline{t}_N,t}=\mathcal{N}^{qR}(\lambda;\underline{t}_N;t)\qquad(\lambda\in\Lambda_N). \tag{4.10}$$

Proof. Let $\tilde{V}\subset(\mathbb{C}^*)^4$ be the set of parameters $\underline{t}\in(\mathbb{C}^*)^4$ for which $t_0t_1t_2t_3\in\mathbb{C}\setminus\mathbb{R}$. Note that there exists an open dense subset $I_N\subset(0,1)$ such that $E_\lambda(\underline{t};t)\neq E_\mu(\underline{t};t)$ for all $\underline{t}\in\tilde{V}$, $t\in I_N$ and all $\lambda,\mu\in\Lambda_N$ with $\lambda\neq\mu$.

Fix $t_0,t_1,t_2\in\mathbb{C}^*$ such that $\#\{\arg(t_i),\arg(t_i^{-1})\,|\,i=0,1,2\}=6$ and $t\in I_N$. Then $\underline{t}_N\in\tilde{V}$ and there exists a sequence $\{t_{3,i}\}_{i\in\mathbb{N}_0}\subset\mathbb{C}^*$ converging to $t^{1-n}t_0^{-1}q^{-N}$ such that $\underline{t}_i:=(t_0,t_1,t_2,t_{3,i})\in V\cap\tilde{V}$ for all i (V given in Definition 2.1). By considering a subsequence if necessary, we may assume that there exist (n,t_0)-residue pairs $(C_i,\mathfrak{C})$ where C_i is a $\underline{t}_i$-contour and where $\mathfrak{C}$ is a deformed circle such that the sequences $\{t_1q^j,t_2q^j,t_{3,i}q^j\}_{j\in\mathbb{N}_0}$ are in the interior of $\mathfrak{C}$ for all i and such that $t^{n-1}t_0q^N$ is in the exterior of $\mathfrak{C}$. Then we obtain from Theorem 2.6, Proposition 3.2 and Proposition 4.1 that

$$\begin{aligned}\frac{\mathcal{N}(\lambda;\underline{t}_i;t)}{K_n(\underline{t}_i;t)}\delta_{\lambda,\mu}&=\frac{1}{(2\pi i)^n}\iint\limits_{z\in\mathfrak{C}^n}(P_\lambda P_\mu)(z;\underline{t}_i;t)\frac{\Delta(z;\underline{t}_i;t)}{K_n(\underline{t}_i;t)}\frac{dz}{z}\\&+\sum_{r=1}^{n}\frac{2^r\big(n-r+1\big)_r}{(2\pi i)^{n-r}}\sum_{\omega\in D(r)}\iint\limits_{z\in\mathfrak{C}^{n-r}}\big(P_\lambda P_\mu\big)(\omega,z;\underline{t}_i;t)\frac{\Delta_r(\omega,z;\underline{t}_i;t)}{K_n(\underline{t}_i;t)}\frac{dz}{z}\end{aligned} \tag{4.11}$$

where $\delta_{\lambda,\mu}$ is the Kronecker-delta and $D(r)=D(r;C_i,\mathfrak{C};t_0;t)$ (3.4) (which is independent of i). By (3.11) and Proposition 4.1 we have

$$\Delta_r(\omega,z;\underline{t}_i;t)=K_r(\underline{t}_i;t)\Delta^{qR}(\omega;\underline{t}_i;t)\Delta(z;\underline{t}_i;t)\delta_c(\omega;z). \tag{4.12}$$

After substitution of (4.12) in the right hand side of (4.11) for all r, it follows from the Bounded Convergence Theorem that we may take the limit $i\to\infty$ within the integrals in the right hand side of (4.11). Only the completely discrete part survives the limit $i\to\infty$ in the equality (4.11) since

$$\lim_{i\to\infty}\frac{K_r(\underline{t}_i;t)}{K_n(\underline{t}_i;t)}=0,\qquad 0\leq r<n$$

by the factor $\big(\rho_n t_3;q\big)_\infty$ in the denominator of $K_n(\underline{t};t)$. The theorem follows now for the specialized parameter values t_0,t_1,t_3,t from the fact that

$$\{\rho q^\lambda\,|\,\lambda\in P(n),\ \lambda_n\leq N\}\subset D(n)$$

and the fact that $\Delta^{qR}(\rho q^\lambda;\underline{t}_N;t)=0$ for $\lambda\in P(n)$ with $\lambda_n>N$. It is now clear that the theorem also holds over the field $\mathbb{F}$. □

The constant term identity can be simplified as follows.

Corollary 4.4. *For $N \in \mathbb{N}$ we have the summation formula*

$$\langle 1,1\rangle_{qR,\underline{t}_N,t} = \prod_{i=1}^{n} \frac{\left(qt_0^2t^{2n-i-1}, qt_1^{-1}t_2^{-1}t^{i-n};q\right)_N}{\left(qt_0t_1^{-1}t^{n-i}, qt_0t_2^{-1}t^{n-i};q\right)_N}. \tag{4.13}$$

Proof. First note that by (2.28), (4.2) and (4.9) we have the explicit formula

$$\mathcal{N}^{qR}(0;\underline{t};t) = \prod_{i=1}^{n} \frac{\left(t_0t_1t_2t_3t^{2n-i-1}, t_0^{-1}t_1t^{1-i}, t_0^{-1}t_2t^{1-i}, t_0^{-1}t_3t^{1-i};q\right)_\infty}{\left(t_0^{-2}t^{1+i-2n}, t_1t_2t^{i-1}, t_1t_3t^{i-1}, t_2t_3t^{i-1};q\right)_\infty}. \tag{4.14}$$

Then (4.13) follows by substitution of $t_3 = t_0^{-1}t^{1-n}q^{-N}$ in (4.14) and by applying formula (4.3) repeatedly (see also [13, section 3]). □

The second order q-difference operator $D_{\underline{t}_N,t}$ (2.16) diagonalizes the q-Racah polynomials $\{P_\lambda(.;\underline{t}_N;t)\}_{\lambda\in\Lambda_N}$. By Theorem 4.3 we conclude that $D_{\underline{t}_N,t}$ is symmetric with respect to $\langle .,.\rangle_{qR,\underline{t}_N,t}$. In [14] the symmetry of $D_{\underline{t}_N,t}$ was proved by direct calculations and the orthogonality relations for the multivariable q-Racah polynomials were proved using the symmetry of $D_{\underline{t}_N,t}$. Furthermore, in [14] the quadratic norms of the q-Racah polynomials were expressed in terms of the quadratic norm of the unit polynomial by studying Pieri formulas for the q-Racah polynomials. The constant term identity (4.13) was recently proved by van Diejen [13, Theorem 3] by truncating a multivariable analogue of Roger's ${}_6\phi_5$-series [13, Theorem 2], which in turn is closely related to an Aomoto-Ito type sum (cf. [3], [20]) for the non-reduced root system BC_n. The proofs of the summation formulas in [13] are based on a multiple ${}_6\psi_6$ summation formula of Gustafson.

In the one-variable case it is known that the Askey-Wilson integral can be rewritten as an infinite sum of residues for some parameter region by shifting the contour over four infinite sequences of poles (see [6, Theorem 2.1]). More generally one can ask the question whether a completely discrete orthogonality measure for the multivariable Askey-Wilson polynomials can be obtained by pulling the $\underline{t}$-contours over certain infinite sequence of poles in the orthogonality relations of the Askey-Wilson polynomials (Theorem 2.6).

Strong indications in that direction can be found in Gustafson's paper [16] and the recent paper of Tarasov and Varchenko [37] where contours in multidimensional integrals are shifted over infinite sequences of poles in order to arrive at (purely discrete) multidimensional Jackson integrals. Another strong indication is the fact that the Macdonald polynomials are orthogonal with respect to Aomoto-Ito type (cf. [3], [20]) weight functions (see Cherednik [11]). Since the B, C and D type Macdonald polynomials can be obtained from the Askey-Wilson polynomials by suitable specialization of the parameters we thus have orthogonality relations for these subfamilies of the Askey-Wilson polynomials with respect to infinite discrete measures (and the corresponding discrete weights are directly related to (4.1), see [13]).

In this paper we will not consider the above mentioned questions, but instead look at the implications of the residue calculus for certain limit cases of the Askey-Wilson polynomials (the big and little q-Jacobi polynomials). In order to study these limit cases we first need to consider the Askey-Wilson polynomials for yet another parameter domain. This will be the subject of the next section.

5. Askey-Wilson polynomials with positive orthogonality measure

In this section we will consider the Askey-Wilson polynomials for parameters $\underline{t}$ in the following parameter domain.

Definition 5.1. *Let V_{AW} be the set of parameters $\underline{t} = (t_0, t_1, t_2, t_3)$ which satisfy the following conditions:*
(1) *The parameters t_0, t_1, t_2, t_3 are real, or if complex, then they appear in conjugate pairs.*
(2) *$t_k t_l \notin \mathbb{R}_{\geq 1}$ for all $0 \leq k < l \leq 3$.*

Note that parameters $\underline{t} \in V_{AW}$ satisfy the following properties:
(A) $t_i \in \mathbb{R}$ if $|t_i| \geq 1$;
(B) There are at most two parameters with modulus ≥ 1. If there are two, then one is positive and the other is negative.

We will show that the multivariable Askey-Wilson polynomials are orthogonal with respect to a positive, partially discrete orthogonality measure when $t \in (0,1)$ and $\underline{t} \in V_{AW}$. We proceed as follows. We apply the residue calculus of section 3 to shift the contour C^n in the integral

$$\frac{1}{(2\pi i)^n} \iint\limits_{z \in C^n} P_\lambda(z) P_\mu(z) \Delta(z) \frac{dz}{z} \tag{5.1}$$

to the n-torus T^n for a specific parameter domain $V_0 \subset V$ (here C is a $\underline{t}$-contour (Definition 2.2) and V is the parameter domain given in Definition 2.1). We then obtain a partially discrete orthogonality measure which turns out to be well defined and positive for parameter values $\underline{t} \in V_{AW}$. Orthogonality relations for parameter values $\underline{t} \in V_{AW}$ with respect to this positive, partially discrete orthogonality measure can then be derived by suitable continuity arguments.

The parameter domain V_0 is defined as follows.

Definition 5.2. *Let V_0 be the set of parameters $\underline{t} \in V$ for which*
(i) at most two parameters have modulus > 1;
(ii) $t_i t^j q^p \notin T$ for $i \in \{0, \ldots, 3\}$, $j \in \{-1, \ldots, n-1\}$ and $p \in \mathbb{Z}$.

Fix $t \in (0,1)$, $\underline{t} \in V_0$ and $0 \leq i \neq j \leq 3$ such that $|t_k| < 1$ for $k \neq i, j$. We write $\rho_p^{(i)} := t^{p-1} t_i$ respectively $\rho_p^{(j)} := t^{p-1} t_j$ for $p \in \mathbb{Z}$. Define for $r \in \mathbb{N}$ a finite discrete set $D_i(r) = D_i(r; \underline{t}; t) \subset \mathbb{C}^r$ by

$$D_i(r) := \{\rho^{(i)} q^\mu \mid \mu \in P(r),\ |\rho_r^{(i)} q^{\mu_r}| > 1\} \tag{5.2}$$

and similarly for $D_j(r)$ (here $P(r)$ is given by (3.2)). We have used here the notation $\rho^{(i)} q^\mu = (\rho_1^{(i)} q^{\mu_1}, \ldots, \rho_r^{(i)} q^{\mu_r})$ for $\mu \in P(r)$. Note that $D_i(r) = \emptyset$ if $|t_i| < 1$. Furthermore, we write $F(r) = F(r; \underline{t}; t) \subset \mathbb{C}^r$ for the disjoint union

$$F(r) := \bigcup_{\substack{l+m=r \\ l,m \in \mathbb{N}_0}} D_i(l) \times D_j(m) \qquad (r = 1, \ldots, n). \tag{5.3}$$

(We use here the convention that $D_i(l) \times D_j(m) = \emptyset$ if $l > 0$ and $D_i(l) = \emptyset$ or if $m > 0$ and $D_j(m) = \emptyset$, and that $D_i(0) \times D_j(m) = D_j(m)$, $D_i(l) \times D_j(0) = D_i(l)$.) Let $\omega \in F(r)$ and $z \in T^{n-r}$ and set

$$d\nu_r^{AW}(\omega, z; \underline{t}; t) := \Delta_r^{AW}(\omega, z; \underline{t}; t) \frac{dz}{z} \tag{5.4}$$

with weight function $\Delta_r^{AW}(\omega,z)$ for $\omega=(\omega^{(i)},\omega^{(j)})$ with $\omega^{(i)}\in D_i(l)$ and $\omega^{(j)}\in D_j(m)$ given by

$$\begin{aligned}\Delta_r^{AW}(\omega^{(i)},\omega^{(j)},z;\underline{t};t):=\Delta^{(d)}(\omega^{(i)};t_i)\Delta^{(d)}(\omega^{(j)};t_j)\Delta(z;\underline{t};t)\\ .\delta_c(\omega^{(i)};\omega^{(j)},z)\delta_c(\omega^{(j)};z)\end{aligned}\tag{5.5}$$

where $\Delta^{(d)}$ is given by (3.5) and δ_c is given by (3.12). In the special case that $l=0$ respectively $m=0$, (5.5) simplifies to

$$\Delta_r^{AW}(\omega^{(j)},z;\underline{t};t)=\Delta^{(d)}(\omega^{(j)};t_j)\Delta(z;\underline{t};t)\delta_c(\omega^{(j)};z)=\Delta_r(\omega^{(j)},z;t_j)\tag{5.6}$$

respectively

$$\Delta_r^{AW}(\omega^{(i)},z;\underline{t};t)=\Delta^{(d)}(\omega^{(i)};t_i)\Delta(z;\underline{t};t)\delta_c(\omega^{(i)};z)=\Delta_r(\omega^{(i)},z;t_i).\tag{5.7}$$

where Δ_r is given by (3.11). We obtain from the residue calculus of section 3 the following lemma.

Lemma 5.3. *Let $t\in(0,1)$ and $\underline{t}\in V_0$. Let C be a $\underline{t}$-contour and $f\in A^W$. Then,*

$$\begin{aligned}\frac{1}{(2\pi i)^n}\iint\limits_{z\in C^n}f(z)d\nu(z)=\frac{1}{(2\pi i)^n}\iint\limits_{z\in T^n}f(z)d\nu(z)\\ +\sum_{r=1}^{n}\frac{2^r\big(n-r+1\big)_r}{(2\pi i)^{n-r}}\sum_{\omega\in F(r)}\iint\limits_{z\in T^{n-r}}f(\omega,z)d\nu_r^{AW}(\omega,z).\end{aligned}\tag{5.8}$$

Proof. If $|t_k|<1$ for all k then we only have the completely continuous measure $d\nu$ on T^n in the right hand side of (5.8) since $F(r)=\emptyset$. Since T is a $\underline{t}$-contour in this case, the lemma follows from Lemma 2.4.

Suppose that at most one parameter has modulus >1. By the symmetry of $d\nu(z;\underline{t};t)$ in the four parameters $\underline{t}$, we may assume that $|t_0|>1$. By Lemma 2.4, we may assume that the $\underline{t}$-contour C satisfies the additional conditions that $A^+:=\{x\in[0,1]\,|\,r_C(x)>1\}$ is an open interval and that $\alpha_0^+\in A^+$ but $\alpha_i^\pm\notin A^+$ for $i=1,2,3$ (here r_C is as in Definition 2.2, and α_i^+ is given by (2.3)). Then (C,T) is a (n,t_0)-residue pair since $\underline{t}\in V_0$ (Definition 5.2) and $D_0(l)=D(l;C,T;t_0)$ (3.4) since t_0 is in the interior of C. The lemma is then a direct consequence of Proposition 3.2 and (5.7).

Suppose now that two parameters have moduli >1. Without loss of generality, we may assume that $|t_0|>1$ and $|t_1|>1$ and that the $\underline{t}$-contour C satisfies the additional condition that

$$\{x\in[0,1]\,|\,r_C(x)>1\}=A_0^+\cup A_1^+$$

disjoint union, with A_i^+ open intervals such that $\alpha_i^+\in A_i^+$ and $\alpha_j^\pm\notin A_i^+$ for $j\neq i$ and $i=0,1$. Let $C':=\phi_{C'}([0,1])$ be the deformed circle with parametrization $\phi_{C'}(x)=r_{C'}(x)e^{2\pi ix}$ given by

$$r_{C'}(x):=r_C(x)\ \ (x\notin A_0^+\cup A_0^-),\quad r_{C'}(x):=1\ \ (x\in A_0^+\cup A_0^-),$$

where $A_0^-:=(1-\beta,1-\alpha)$ when $A_0^+=(\alpha,\beta)$. Then (C,C') is a (n,t_0)-residue pair, (C',T) is a (n,t_1)-residue pair and $D_0(l)=D(l;C,C';t_0)$ respectively $D_1(m)=D(m;C',T;t_1)$ since t_0 and t_1 are in the interior of C. Write Ω' for the domain associated with (C',T), then $\delta_c(\omega^{(0)};.)\in\mathcal{O}_W\big((\Omega')^{n-l}\big)$ for $\omega^{(0)}\in D_0(l)$, hence the lemma follows by applying Proposition 3.2 first to the (n,t_0)-residue pair (C,C'), and then to the (n,t_1)-residue pair (C',T). $\square$

For $t=q^k$ with $k\in\mathbb{N}$, (5.8) can be rewritten as

$$\begin{aligned}\frac{1}{(2\pi i)^n}\iint\limits_{z\in C^n} f(z)d\nu(z) &= \sum_{r=0}^{n}\frac{2^r\binom{n}{r}}{(2\pi i)^{n-r}}\sum_{e_1,\dots,e_r}\sum_{\substack{z_i\in\{e_i,\dots,e_iq^{N_{e_i}}\}\\ i=1,\dots,r}}\\ &\iint\limits_{(z_{r+1},\dots,z_n)\in T^{n-r}} f(z)\delta(z;q^k)\prod_{i=1}^{r}w_d(z_i;e_i)\prod_{j=r+1}^{n}w_c(z_j)\frac{dz_j}{z_j}\end{aligned}\tag{5.9}$$

for $f\in A^W$, where the sum is over $e_i\in\{t_j\,|\,|t_j|>1\}$ and N_{e_i} is the largest positive integer such that $|e_iq^{N_{e_i}}|>1$. This follows from the fact that $\delta(z;q^k)=0$ if $z_i=q^lz_j$ for some $i\neq j$ and some $l\in\{0,\dots,k-1\}$ and from the fact that

$$w_d(x;e_iq^l)=\big(e_ix,e_ix^{-1};q\big)_l w_d(x;e_i),\quad (x=e_iq^{l+m},m\in\mathbb{N}_0).$$

Remark 5.4. *Note that $\delta(.;t)\in A^W$ when $t=q^k$ with $k\in\mathbb{N}$. In particular, we will only encounter residues of the factor $\prod_{i=1}^n w_c(z_i)$ when deforming C^n for parameter $t=q^k$ ($k\in\mathbb{N}$) to the torus T^n in the left hand side of* (5.9). *Consequently* (5.9) *can also be proved by induction on n using the residue calculus for the one-variable weight functions w_c and using the W-invariance of the integrand in the left hand side of* (5.9).

We define bilinear forms $\langle .,.\rangle_{r,\underline{t},t}$ on A^W for $r\in\{0,\dots,n\}$, $\underline{t}\in V_0$ and $t\in(0,1)$ by

$$\begin{aligned}\langle f,g\rangle_0 &:= \iint\limits_{z\in T^n} f(z)g(z)d\nu(z),\\ \langle f,g\rangle_r &:= \sum_{\omega\in F(r)}\iint\limits_{z\in T^{n-r}} f(\omega,z)g(\omega,z)d\nu_r^{AW}(\omega,z),\quad r\in\{1,\dots,n\}\end{aligned}\tag{5.10}$$

for $f,g\in A^W$ and we set

$$\langle f,g\rangle_{\underline{t},t} := \sum_{r=0}^{n}\frac{2^r\big(n-r+1\big)_r}{(2\pi i)^{n-r}}\langle f,g\rangle_{r,\underline{t},t},\quad f,g\in A^W.\tag{5.11}$$

In the following lemma we consider the symmetric bilinear form $\langle .,.\rangle_{\underline{t},t}$ for parameter values $(\underline{t},t)\in V_{AW}\times(0,1)$.

Lemma 5.5. *Let $t\in(0,1)$ and $\underline{t}\in V_{AW}$.*
(i) *The bilinear form $\langle .,.\rangle_{\underline{t},t}$ is well defined;*
(ii) *The weight function $\Delta(z;\underline{t};t)$ respectively $\Delta_r^{AW}(\omega,z;\underline{t};t)$ is positive for $z\in T^n$ respectively $(\omega,z)\in F(r)\times T^{n-r}$ ($r=1,\dots,n$).*

Proof. The discrete weights w_d (3.9) appearing as factors of the weight function $\Delta_r^{AW}(\omega,z)$ for $r>0$ are well defined and strict positive. Indeed if $t_0t_1t_2t_3=0$, then the factors $(t_iq/t_j;q)_k\,t_j^k$ in the denominator of w_d (3.9) should be read as $\prod_{l=0}^{k-1}\big(t_j-t_iq^{l+1}\big)$. The factor $\delta(z;t)=|\delta_+(z;t)|^2$ is also well defined and positive for $z\in T^{n-r}$.

Without loss of generality we may assume that $|t_2|,|t_3|<1$. Fix $\omega=(\vartheta,\upsilon)\in F(r)$ with $\vartheta\in D_0(l)$ and $\upsilon\in D_1(m)$ ($r=l+m$). The factor $\delta_d(\vartheta)$ respectively $\delta_d(\upsilon)$ (3.7) appearing in the discrete weights $\Delta^{(d)}(\vartheta;t_0)$ respectively $\Delta^{(d)}(\upsilon;t_1)$ when $l>0$ respectively $m>0$ is well defined and strict positive. Indeed, if

$\vartheta \in D_0(l)$ and $l > 0$, then we have $|t_0| > 1$, hence $t_0 \in \mathbb{R}$. Then $\delta_d(\vartheta) > 0$ follows easily from the definition of the set $D_0(l)$ (5.2).

Remains to show that $h(z) := \big(\prod_{l=1}^{n-r} w_c(z_l;\underline{t})\big)\delta_c(\vartheta;\upsilon,z)\delta_c(\upsilon;z)$ is well defined and positive for $z \in T^{n-r}$. Let us check the case that both t_0 and t_1 have moduli ≥ 1, and that t_0 is positive real and t_1 negative real (see property **(B)** for parameters $\underline{t} \in V_{AW}$). The case that at most one parameter has modulus ≥ 1 will then also be clear.

Rewrite the factor $\big(x^2, x^{-2}; q\big)_\infty$ appearing in the numerator of $w_c(x;\underline{t})$ as

$$\big(x^2, x^{-2}; q\big)_\infty = \big(x, -x, x^{-1}, -x^{-1}; q\big)_\infty \big(qx^2, qx^{-2}; q^2\big)_\infty$$

then it is sufficient to check that the factors of the form

$$\begin{aligned} h_0(x) &:= \frac{\big(x, x^{-1}; q\big)_\infty}{\big(t_0x, t_0x^{-1}; q\big)_\infty} \prod_{k=1}^{l} \big(\vartheta_k x, \vartheta_k x^{-1}, \vartheta_k^{-1}x, \vartheta_k^{-1}x^{-1}; q\big)_\tau, \\ h_1(x) &:= \frac{\big(-x, -x^{-1}; q\big)_\infty}{\big(t_1x, t_1x^{-1}; q\big)_\infty} \prod_{k=1}^{m} \big(\upsilon_k x, \upsilon_k x^{-1}, \upsilon_k^{-1}x, \upsilon_k^{-1}x^{-1}; q\big)_\tau \end{aligned}$$

($l, m \in \{0, \ldots, n-1\}$) are well defined and positive for $x \in T$ (here $t = q^\tau$). Indeed, the remaining factors of $w_c(x;\underline{t})$ are easily seen to be well defined and positive since $|t_2|, |t_3| < 1$ and t_2, t_3 are both real or are a conjugate pair, while the remaining factors

$$\prod_{\epsilon_i,\epsilon_j=\pm 1} \big(\vartheta_i^{\epsilon_i}\upsilon_j^{\epsilon_j}; q\big)_\tau \quad (i \in \{1, \ldots, l\},\, j \in \{1, \ldots, m\})$$

of $\delta_c(\vartheta;\upsilon,z)$ are well defined and positive since t_0 is positive real and t_1 is negative real. Now let $\lambda \in P(l)$ such that $\vartheta = \rho^{(0)}q^\lambda \in D_0(l)$, then $h_0(x) = |h_0^+(x)|^2$ for $x \in T$ with h_0^+ given by

$$\begin{aligned} h_0^+(x) &:= \frac{\big(x; q\big)_\infty}{\big(t_0x; q\big)_\infty} \prod_{k=1}^{l} \big(\vartheta_k x, \vartheta_k^{-1}x; q\big)_\tau \\ &= \frac{\big(x; q\big)_\infty}{\big(t\vartheta_l x; q\big)_\infty} \prod_{k=1}^{l} \frac{\big(\vartheta_k^{-1}x; q\big)_\tau}{\big(t\vartheta_{k-1}x; q\big)_{\lambda_k-\lambda_{k-1}}} \end{aligned}$$

where $\vartheta_0 := t^{-1}t_0$ and $\lambda_0 := 0$. It follows that $h_0^+(x)$ is well defined for $x \in T$, since the possible zero at $x = 1$ of the factor $\big(t\vartheta_l x; q\big)_\infty$ in the denominator can be compensated by the zero at $x = 1$ of the factor $\big(x; q\big)_\infty$. Similarly, one deals with $h_1(x)$. ☐

Let $A_{\mathbb{R}}^W$ be the $\mathbb{R}$-algebra of W-invariant Laurent polynomials in the variables $z_1, \ldots, z_n$. We obtain from Lemma 5.5 the following corollary.

Corollary 5.6. *Let* $\underline{t} \in V_{AW}$ *and* $t \in (0,1)$. *Then the restriction of the bilinear form* $\langle .,. \rangle_{\underline{t},t}$ *to* $A_{\mathbb{R}}^W \times A_{\mathbb{R}}^W$ *maps into* $\mathbb{R}$ *and is positive definite.*

Proof. The monomials m_λ ($\lambda \in \Lambda$) are real valued on $F(r) \times T^{n-r}$ since $F(r) \subset \mathbb{R}^r$ by property **(A)** for parameters in V_{AW} (Definition 5.1), so the assertion follows from Lemma 5.5**(ii)**. ☐

The following theorem defines the Askey-Wilson polynomials for parameters $\underline{t} \in V_{AW}$ and $t \in (0,1)$ as a special choice of orthogonal basis for $A_{\mathbb{R}}^W$ with respect to the *positive definite* bilinear form $\langle .,. \rangle_{\underline{t},t} : A_{\mathbb{R}}^W \times A_{\mathbb{R}}^W \to \mathbb{R}$.

Theorem 5.7. *Let* $t \in (0,1)$ *and* $\underline{t} \in V_{AW}$. *Then there exists a unique basis* $\{P_\lambda(.;\underline{t};t)\}_{\lambda\in\Lambda}$ *of* $A_{\mathbb{R}}^W$ *such that*

(i) $P_\lambda(.;\underline{t};t) = m_\lambda + \sum_{\mu<\lambda} c_{\lambda,\mu}(\underline{t};t)m_\mu$, *some* $c_{\lambda,\mu}(\underline{t};t) \in \mathbb{R}$;

(ii) $\langle P_\lambda(.;\underline{t};t), P_\mu(.;\underline{t};t)\rangle_{\underline{t},t} = 0$ *if* $\mu \neq \lambda$.

Furthermore, $P_\lambda(.;\underline{t};t)$ *is an eigenfunction of* $D_{\underline{t},t}$ *with eigenvalue* $E_\lambda(\underline{t};t)$ *and we have the explicit evaluation formula*

$$\langle P_\lambda(.;\underline{t};t), P_\lambda(.;\underline{t};t)\rangle_{\underline{t},t} = \mathcal{N}(\lambda;\underline{t};t), \quad \lambda \in \Lambda$$

for the quadratic norms of the polynomials P_λ.

Proof. Fix $t \in (0,1)$ and $\underline{t} \in V_{AW}$. Since $\langle .,.\rangle_{\underline{t},t}$ is positive definite on $A_{\mathbb{R}}^W$, there exists for $\lambda \in \Lambda$ a unique W-invariant Laurent polynomial $P_\lambda(.;\underline{t};t) \in A_{\mathbb{R}}^W$ satisfying (**i**) and the conditions $\langle P_\lambda(.;\underline{t};t), m_\mu\rangle_{\underline{t};t} = 0$ for all $\mu < \lambda$. Furthermore, we have

$$P_\lambda(z;\underline{t};t) = m_\lambda(z) - \sum_{\mu<\lambda} \frac{\langle m_\lambda, P_\mu(.;\underline{t};t)\rangle_{\underline{t},t}}{\langle P_\mu(.;\underline{t};t), P_\mu(.;\underline{t};t)\rangle_{\underline{t},t}} P_\mu(z;\underline{t};t), \quad \lambda \in \Lambda. \tag{5.12}$$

By Lemma 5.3, the polynomials $P_\lambda(z;\underline{t};t) = m_\lambda(z) + \sum_{\mu<\lambda} c_{\lambda,\mu}(\underline{t};t)m_\mu(z)$ for $\underline{t} \in V_0$ defined in Theorem 2.6 can be given by the same formula (5.12). Fix $\underline{t} \in V_{AW} \setminus V_{AW}^-$, where V_{AW}^- is the set of parameters $\underline{t} \in V_{AW}$ such that $t_i = \pm t^{-m}q^{-s}$ for some $i \in \{0,\ldots,3\}$, $m \in \{0,\ldots,n-1\}$ and $s \in \mathbb{N}_0$. Let $\{\underline{t}_k\}_{k\in\mathbb{N}_0}$ be a sequence in V_0 converging to $\underline{t}$. Then, by the Bounded Convergence Theorem,

$$\lim_{k\to\infty} \langle f,g\rangle_{\underline{t}_k,t} = \langle f,g\rangle_{\underline{t},t}, \quad \forall f,g \in A^W. \tag{5.13}$$

Indeed, by assuming $\underline{t} \notin V_{AW}^-$, we have that $F(r;\underline{\tau};t) = F(r;\underline{t};t)$ for $\underline{\tau}$ in an open neighbourhood of $\underline{t}$ ($r = 1,\ldots,n$) and that no zeros in the denominator of the expression for $\Delta_r^{AW}(\omega,.;\underline{t};t)$ ($\omega \in F(r)$, $r = 0,\ldots,n-1$) occur which need to be compensated by zeros in the numerator (see the proof of Lemma 5.5). Hence the Bounded Convergence Theorem may be applied at once.

By induction on λ we then obtain from (5.12) and (5.13) that

$$\lim_{k\to\infty} c_{\lambda,\mu}(\underline{t}_k;t) = c_{\lambda,\mu}(\underline{t};t), \quad \mu < \lambda. \tag{5.14}$$

By the residue calculus given in Lemma 5.3, we can reformulate Theorem 2.6 with respect to the the bilinear form $\langle .,.\rangle_{\underline{\tau},t}$ for $\underline{\tau} \in V_0$. The theorem follows then for $\underline{t} \in V_{AW} \setminus V_{AW}^-$ by taking limits in the reformulated results using Proposition 2.5 and (5.14).

To prove the theorem for $\underline{t} \in V_{AW}^-$, we use again a continuity argument. We treat here one typical example, the general case is derived similarly. We assume that $\underline{t} \in V_{AW}^-$ with $t_0 = t^{-m}q^{-s}$ for some $m \in \{0,\ldots,n-1\}$, $s \in \mathbb{N}_0$ and that $t_i \neq t^{-l}q^{-s'}$ for all $i \in \{1,2,3\}$, $l \in \{0,\ldots,n-1\}$ and $s' \in \mathbb{N}_0$. Then there exists an $\epsilon > 0$ such that $(\tau_0,t_1,t_2,t_3) \in V_{AW} \setminus V_{AW}^-$ and $F(r;\tau_0,t_1,t_2,t_3;t) = F(r;\underline{t};t)$ for all $r \in \{1,\ldots,n\}$ and all $\tau_0 \in \mathbb{R}_{>0}$ with $t_0 - \tau_0 < \epsilon$. We claim that

$$\lim_{\tau_0\uparrow t_0} \langle f,g\rangle_{\tau_0,t_1,t_2,t_3,t} = \langle f,g\rangle_{\underline{t},t}, \qquad \forall f,g \in A^W. \tag{5.15}$$

We use the Bounded Convergence Theorem. In Lemma 5.5 we have seen that zeros in the denominator of the expression for the weight function $\Delta_r^{AW}(\omega,.;\underline{\tau};t)$ can occur when $\omega \in F(r;\underline{\tau};t)$ and $\underline{\tau} \in V_{AW}^-$, and that these zeros can be compensated by zeros in the numerator. This amounts to replacing factors of the form

$$\frac{(1 \pm x)}{(1 \pm ux)}$$

in the weight function by 1 when $u = 1$. For the application of the Bounded Convergence Theorem in the limit (5.15), it therefore suffices to note that the functions

$$h^{\pm}(u,x) := \begin{cases} \frac{(1 \pm x)}{(1 \pm ux)} & \text{if } \; u \neq 1 \\ 1 & \text{if } u = 1 \end{cases} \tag{5.16}$$

are bounded on $U \times T$ where $U \subset \mathbb{R}_{>0}$ is some open set containing 1. Now the theorem for the specific parameter values $\underline{t}$ follows by continuity arguments from (5.15). $\square$

For parameters $\underline{t} \in V_{AW}$ with $|t_i| \leq 1$ the orthogonality measure is completely continuous (i.e. we have $\langle .,. \rangle = \langle .,. \rangle_0$) and coincides with Koornwinder's orthogonality measure [24]. In particular the orthogonality relations reduce to Koornwinder's orthogonality relations (see [24]) and the quadratic norm evaluations reduce to van Diejen's quadratic norm evaluations (see [12]) for parameter values $\underline{t} \in V_{AW}$ with $|t_i| \leq 1$ for all i.

Theorem 5.7 implies that $D_{\underline{t},t}$ is symmetric with respect to $\langle .,. \rangle_{\underline{t},t}$. The symmetry of D and the orthogonality of the Askey-Wilson polynomials with respect to $\langle .,. \rangle$ have been proved by different methods in [34] for deformation parameter $t = q^k$ with $k \in \mathbb{N}$. In this case special case we can rewrite the bilinear form $\langle .,. \rangle_{\underline{t},q^k}$ using (5.9) and we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \langle f,g \rangle = \sum_{r=0}^{n} \frac{2^r \binom{n}{r}}{(2\pi i)^{n-r}} \sum_{e_1,\ldots,e_r} \sum_{\substack{z_i \in \{e_i,\ldots,e_i q^{N_{e_i}}\} \\ i=1,\ldots,r}} \iint_{(z_{r+1},\ldots,z_n) \in T^{n-r}} & \\ f(z)g(z)\delta(z;q^k) \prod_{i=1}^{r} w_d(z_i;e_i) \prod_{j=r+1}^{n} w_c(z_j) \frac{dz_j}{z_j} & \end{aligned} \tag{5.17}$$

for $f,g \in A^W$.

Theorem 5.7 for $n = 1$ reduces to the orthogonality relations and norm evaluations stated in [6, Theorem 2.5].

6. Limit transition to little q-Jacobi polynomials

In this section we consider a limit case of the Askey-Wilson polynomials with positive partially discrete orthogonality measure (Theorem 5.7) for which the continuous part of the orthogonality measure disappears while the completely discrete part of the orthogonality measure blows up to an infinite discrete measure.

We will obtain as limit the family of multivariable little q-Jacobi polynomials (previously introduced in [32]) which depends (besides on $q, t \in (0,1)$) on two parameters. The parameter domain for the little q-Jacobi polynomials is defined as follows.

Definition 6.1. *Let V_L be the set of parameters (a,b) for which $a \in \big(0, 1/q\big)$ and $b \in \big(-\infty, 1/q\big)$.*

For functions $f : \mathbb{C} \to \mathbb{C}$ and $u, v \in \mathbb{C}$, the Jackson q-integral of f over $[u, v]$ is defined by

$$\int_u^v f(x)d_qx \quad := \quad \int_0^v f(x)d_qx - \int_0^u f(x)d_qx, \tag{6.1}$$

$$\int_0^v f(x)d_qx \quad := \quad (1-q)\sum_{k=0}^{\infty} f(vq^k)vq^k, \tag{6.2}$$

provided that the infinite sums are absolutely convergent. For a point $\xi \in (\mathbb{C}^*)^n$, we define the Jackson integral of f over the set

$$\langle\xi\rangle_n := \{\xi q^\nu \mid \nu \in P(n)\} \tag{6.3}$$

(here $\xi q^\nu := (\xi_1 q^{\nu_1}, \dots, \xi_n q^{\nu_n})$), by

$$\iint\limits_{\langle\xi\rangle_n} f(z)d_qz := (1-q)^n \sum_{\nu\in P(n)} f(\xi q^\nu)\prod_{i=1}^n \xi_i q^{\nu_i} \tag{6.4}$$

provided that the multisum is absolutely convergent. Note that for special points $\xi = (\xi_1, \xi_1\gamma, \dots, \xi_1\gamma^{n-1}) \in \big(\mathbb{C}^*\big)^n$, the multisum (6.4) can be expressed as an iterated Jackson integral by

$$\iint\limits_{\langle\xi\rangle_n} f(z)d_qz = \int_{z_1=0}^{\xi_1}\int_{z_2=0}^{\gamma z_1}\dots\int_{z_n=0}^{\gamma z_{n-1}} f(z)d_qz_n\dots d_qz_1. \tag{6.5}$$

Let $A_{\mathbb{R}}^S$ be the $\mathbb{R}$-algebra of S-invariant polynomials in the variables $z_1, \dots, z_n$. An $\mathbb{R}$-basis for $A_{\mathbb{R}}^S$ is given by the set of monomials $\{\tilde{m}_\lambda\}_{\lambda\in\Lambda}$, where $\tilde{m}_\lambda(z) := \sum_{\mu\in S\lambda} z^\mu$. Define a symmetric bilinear form $\langle .,.\rangle_{L,t}^{a,b}$ on $A_{\mathbb{R}}^S$ for $t \in (0,1)$ and $(a,b) \in V_L$ by

$$\langle f, g\rangle_L := \iint\limits_{\langle\rho_L\rangle_n} f(z)g(z)\Delta^L(z)d_qz, \quad f, g \in A_{\mathbb{R}}^S \tag{6.6}$$

where $\rho_{L,i} := t^{i-1}$ and where the weight function $\Delta^L(z) = \Delta^L(z; a, b; t)$ is given by

$$\Delta^L(z) := q^{-2\tau^2\binom{n}{3}}t^{-(\alpha+1)\binom{n}{2}}\left(\prod_{i=1}^n v_L(z_i)\right)\delta_{qJ}(z), \qquad (a = q^\alpha, t = q^\tau) \tag{6.7}$$

with

$$v_L(x; a, b) := \frac{\big(qx;q\big)_\infty}{\big(qbx;q\big)_\infty}x^\alpha, \qquad (a = q^\alpha) \tag{6.8}$$

and with interaction factor $\delta_{qJ}(z;t)$ given by

$$\delta_{qJ}(z;t) := \prod_{1\le i<j\le n} |z_i - z_j||z_i|^{2\tau-1}\big(qt^{-1}z_j/z_i;q\big)_{2\tau-1}, \qquad (t = q^\tau). \tag{6.9}$$

The function v_L is exactly the weight function in the orthogonality measure for the one-variable little q-Jacobi polynomials [1]. The same bilinear form $\langle .,.\rangle_L$ was considered in [32, section 5], up to the positive constant $q^{-2\tau^2\binom{n}{3}}t^{-(\alpha+1)\binom{n}{2}}$. The weights $\Delta^L(z)$ in the bilinear form $\langle .,.\rangle_L$ are strict positive for $z \in \langle\rho_L\rangle_n$ and $\langle f, g\rangle_L$, written out as a multidimensional infinite sum, is absolutely convergent for all $f, g \in A_{\mathbb{R}}^S$ (see [32]).

Definition 6.2. *Let* $t \in (0,1)$ *and* $(a,b) \in V_L$. *The little* q*-Jacobi polynomials* $\{P_\lambda^L(.;a,b;t)\}_{\lambda\in\Lambda}$ *are uniquely defined by the two conditions*
(a) $P_\lambda^L = \tilde{m}_\lambda + \sum_{\mu<\lambda} c_{\lambda,\mu}^L \tilde{m}_\mu$ *for certain constants* $c_{\lambda,\mu}^L = c_{\lambda,\mu}^L(a,b;t) \in \mathbb{R}$;
(b) $\langle P_\lambda^L, \tilde{m}_\mu\rangle_L = 0$ *for* $\mu < \lambda$.

The following proposition establishes the link between Askey-Wilson polynomials with positive partially discrete orthogonality measure and the little q-Jacobi polynomials. We use in the proposition the notation $|\lambda| := \sum_{i=1}^n \lambda_i$ for the length of a partition $\lambda \in \Lambda$.

Proposition 6.3. *Let* $t \in (0,1)$, $(a,b) \in V_L$ *and define for* $\epsilon \in \mathbb{R}^*$

$$\underline{t}_L(\epsilon) := \bigl(\epsilon^{-1}q^{\frac{1}{2}}, -aq^{\frac{1}{2}}, \epsilon bq^{\frac{1}{2}}, -q^{\frac{1}{2}}\bigr). \tag{6.10}$$

Then there exists a sequence $\{\epsilon_k\}_{k\in\mathbb{N}_0}$ *in* $\mathbb{R}_{>0}$ *converging to* 0 *such that*

$$\begin{aligned}\lim_{k\to\infty}\left(\prod_{i=1}^n\bigl(-\epsilon_k^{-1}qt^{i-1}, -\epsilon_k^{-1}qat^{i-1};q\bigr)_\infty\right)\bigl(\epsilon_k q^{-\frac{1}{2}}\bigr)^{|\lambda|+|\mu|}\langle m_\lambda, m_\mu\rangle_{\underline{t}_L(\epsilon_k),t}\\ = 2^n n!\bigl(q;q\bigr)_\infty^{-2n}(1-q)^{-n}\langle \tilde{m}_\lambda, \tilde{m}_\mu\rangle_{L,t}^{a,b}\end{aligned} \tag{6.11}$$

for all $\lambda, \mu \in \Lambda$, *where* $\langle .,.\rangle_{\underline{t},t}$ *is given by* (5.11).

The proof of the proposition will be given in section 8. Note that $\underline{t}_L(\epsilon) \in V_{AW}$ for $\epsilon \in \mathbb{R}_{>0}$ sufficiently small, so $\langle .,.\rangle_{\underline{t}_L(\epsilon),t}$ is well defined for $\epsilon > 0$ sufficiently small by Lemma 5.5.

We will use Proposition 6.3 to prove that the little q-Jacobi polynomials are limit cases of the Askey-Wilson polynomials and to establish orthogonality relations and norm evaluations for the little q-Jacobi polynomials with respect to the bilinear form $\langle .,.\rangle_L$.

We use the following definition of limit transitions between S-invariant Laurent polynomials (cf. [35]). Let $f(.;u)$ ($u \in \mathbb{R}^*$) and f be S-invariant Laurent polynomials in n variables $z_1,\ldots,z_n$, then we write $\lim_{u\to 0} f(.;u) = f$ if $\lim_{u\to 0} f(z;u) = f(z)$ for all $z \in (\mathbb{R}^*)^n$. Note that the $\mathbb{R}$-algebra of S-invariant Laurent polynomials has as $\mathbb{R}$-basis the set of monomials $\{\tilde{m}_\lambda(z)\}_{\lambda\in\tilde{\Lambda}}$, where $\tilde{\Lambda} := \{\lambda \in \mathbb{Z}^n \mid \lambda_1 \geq \lambda_2 \geq \ldots \geq \lambda_n\}$ and $\tilde{m}_\lambda(z) := \sum_{\mu\in S\lambda} z^\mu$. If $f(.;u) = \sum_{\lambda\in\tilde{\Lambda}} c_\lambda(u)\tilde{m}_\lambda$ ($u \in \mathbb{R}^*$) and $f = \sum_{\lambda\in\tilde{\Lambda}} c_\lambda \tilde{m}_\lambda$ such that $\{\lambda \in \tilde{\Lambda} \mid c_\lambda(u) \neq 0\}$ is contained in some finite u-independent subset for $|u|$ sufficiently small, then we have $\lim_{u\to 0} f(.;u) = f$ iff $\lim_{u\to 0} c_\lambda(u) = c_\lambda$ for all $\lambda \in \tilde{\Lambda}$. Crucial in the limit from Askey-Wilson polynomials to little q-Jacobi polynomials is a limit from rescaled monomials $m_\lambda(z|u)$ to $\tilde{m}_\lambda(z)$, where the rescaled monomial $m_\lambda(z|u)$ for $u \in \mathbb{R}^*$ is the S-invariant Laurent polynomial given by

$$m_\lambda(z|u) := u^{|\lambda|}m_\lambda(u^{-1}z), \quad \lambda \in \Lambda. \tag{6.12}$$

Here we have used the notation $u^{-1}z := (u^{-1}z_1,\ldots,u^{-1}z_n)$. In terms of the basis $\{\tilde{m}_\mu\}_{\mu\in\tilde{\Lambda}}$, we have $m_\lambda(z|u) = \sum_{\mu\in\tilde{\Lambda}\cap W\lambda} d_{\lambda,\mu}(u)\tilde{m}_\mu(z)$ for $\lambda \in \Lambda$ with $d_{\lambda,\mu}(u)$ homogeneous of degree $|\lambda| - |\mu|$ and $d_{\lambda,\lambda}(u) \equiv 1$. Furthermore we have for $\lambda \in \Lambda$ that $|\mu| \leq |\lambda|$ if $\mu \in W\lambda$ and $|\lambda| = |\mu|$ iff $\mu \in S\lambda$. Hence we obtain the limit transitions

$$\lim_{u\to 0} m_\lambda(z|u) = \tilde{m}_\lambda(z) \qquad (\lambda \in \Lambda). \tag{6.13}$$

We express the quadratic norm of the little q-Jacobi polynomials in terms of functions $\mathcal{N}^+_{qJ}(\lambda)=\mathcal{N}^+_{qJ}(\lambda;a,b;t)$ and $\mathcal{N}^-_{qJ}(\lambda)=\mathcal{N}^-_{qJ}(\lambda;a,b;t)$ which are defined by

$$\begin{aligned}\mathcal{N}^+_{qJ}(\lambda) &:= \prod_{i=1}^{n}\frac{\Gamma_q(\lambda_i+1+(n-i)\tau+\alpha+\beta)\Gamma_q(\lambda_i+1+(n-i)\tau+\alpha)}{\Gamma_q(2\lambda_i+1+2(n-i)\tau+\alpha+\beta)}\\ &\quad\cdot\prod_{1\le j<k\le n}\biggl(\frac{\Gamma_q(\lambda_j+\lambda_k+1+(2n-j-k+1)\tau+\alpha+\beta)}{\Gamma_q(\lambda_j+\lambda_k+1+(2n-j-k)\tau+\alpha+\beta)}\\ &\qquad\cdot\frac{\Gamma_q(\lambda_j-\lambda_k+(k-j+1)\tau)}{\Gamma_q(\lambda_j-\lambda_k+(k-j)\tau)}\biggr)\end{aligned}\tag{6.14}$$

$$\begin{aligned}\mathcal{N}^-_{qJ}(\lambda) &:= \prod_{i=1}^{n}\frac{\Gamma_q(\lambda_i+1+(n-i)\tau)\Gamma_q(\lambda_i+1+(n-i)\tau+\beta)}{\Gamma_q(2\lambda_i+2+2(n-i)\tau+\alpha+\beta)}\\ &\quad\cdot\prod_{1\le j<k\le n}\biggl(\frac{\Gamma_q(\lambda_j+\lambda_k+2+(2n-j-k-1)\tau+\alpha+\beta)}{\Gamma_q(\lambda_j+\lambda_k+2+(2n-j-k)\tau+\alpha+\beta)}\\ &\qquad\cdot\frac{\Gamma_q(\lambda_j-\lambda_k+1+(k-j-1)\tau)}{\Gamma_q(\lambda_j-\lambda_k+1+(k-j)\tau)}\biggr),\end{aligned}\tag{6.15}$$

where $a=q^\alpha, b=q^\beta$, $t=q^\tau$ and where

$$\Gamma_q(u):=\frac{(q;q)_{u-1}}{(1-q)^{u-1}}\qquad (u\notin -\mathbb{N}_0)\tag{6.16}$$

is the q-gamma function. For $\lambda\in\Lambda$, $(a,b)\in V_L$ and $t\in(0,1)$ let $\mathcal{N}^L(\lambda)=\mathcal{N}^L(\lambda;a,b;t)$ be given by

$$\mathcal{N}^L(\lambda):=q^{\sum_{i=1}^n(\lambda_i+\alpha+2(n-i)\tau)\lambda_i}\mathcal{N}^+_{qJ}(\lambda)\mathcal{N}^-_{qJ}(\lambda).\tag{6.17}$$

Note that $\mathcal{N}^L(\lambda)$ is well defined and positive. We have now the following theorem.

Theorem 6.4. *Let $(a,b)\in V_L$ and $t\in(0,1)$. There exists a sequence $\{\epsilon_k\}_{k\in\mathbb{N}_0}$ in $\mathbb{R}_{>0}$ converging to 0 such that*

$$\lim_{k\to\infty}\left(q^{-\frac{1}{2}}\epsilon_k\right)^{|\lambda|}P_\lambda\bigl(q^{\frac{1}{2}}\epsilon_k^{-1}z;\underline{t}_L(\epsilon_k);t\bigr)=P^L_\lambda(z;a,b;t)\tag{6.18}$$

for all $\lambda\in\Lambda$. Furthermore, the polynomials $\{P^L_\lambda\}_{\lambda\in\Lambda}$ are orthogonal with respect to $\langle .,.\rangle_L$ and the quadratic norms of the little q-Jacobi polynomials are given by

$$\langle P^L_\lambda,P^L_\lambda\rangle_L=\mathcal{N}^L(\lambda),\quad \lambda\in\Lambda.\tag{6.19}$$

Proof. We write

$$\begin{aligned}\bigl(q^{-\frac{1}{2}}\epsilon\bigr)^{|\lambda|}P_\lambda\bigl(z;\underline{t}_L(\epsilon);t\bigr)&=\sum_{\mu\le\lambda}c_{\lambda,\mu}(\epsilon)\bigl(q^{-\frac{1}{2}}\epsilon\bigr)^{|\mu|}m_\mu(z),\\ P^L_\lambda(z;a,b;t)&=\sum_{\mu\le\lambda}c^L_{\lambda,\mu}\tilde{m}_\mu(z)\end{aligned}\tag{6.20}$$

for the expansions of the Askey-Wilson polynomial and the little q-Jacobi polynomial in terms of monomials. In particular, we have $c_{\lambda,\lambda}(\epsilon)=c^L_{\lambda,\lambda}=1$. Let $\{\epsilon_k\}_{k\in\mathbb{N}_0}$ be a sequence in $\mathbb{R}_{>0}$ converging to 0 such that (6.11) is satisfied for all $\lambda,\mu\in\Lambda$. We will prove that

$$\lim_{k\to\infty}c_{\lambda,\mu}(\epsilon_k)=c^L_{\lambda,\mu}\quad\forall\,\mu\le\lambda,\tag{6.21}$$

then the limit (6.18) follows from (6.13), (6.20) and (6.21). We proceed by induction on λ. The case $\lambda = 0$ is trivial. For $\lambda \neq 0$, note that $\underline{t}_L(\epsilon) \in V_{AW}$ for $\epsilon > 0$ sufficiently small, hence by Theorem 5.7 we can write

(6.22)
$$\big(q^{-\frac{1}{2}}\epsilon\big)^{|\lambda|}P_\lambda\big(q^{\frac{1}{2}}z;\underline{t}_L(\epsilon);t\big) = \big(q^{-\frac{1}{2}}\epsilon\big)^{|\lambda|}m_\lambda(z) - \sum_{\mu<\lambda} d_{\lambda,\mu}(\epsilon)\big(q^{-\frac{1}{2}}\epsilon\big)^{|\mu|}P_\mu\big(z;\underline{t}_L(\epsilon);t\big)$$

with

$$d_{\lambda,\mu}(\epsilon) := \frac{(q^{-\frac{1}{2}}\epsilon)^{|\lambda|+|\mu|}\langle m_\lambda, P_\mu(.;\underline{t}_L(\epsilon);t)\rangle_{\underline{t}_L(\epsilon),t}}{(q^{-\frac{1}{2}}\epsilon)^{2|\mu|}\langle P_\mu(.;\underline{t}_L(\epsilon);t), P_\mu(.;\underline{t}_L(\epsilon);t)\rangle_{\underline{t}_L(\epsilon),t}}$$

for $\epsilon > 0$ sufficiently small. For the little q-Jacobi polynomials we have

$$P_\lambda^L(z;a,b;t) = \tilde{m}_\lambda(z) - \sum_{\mu<\lambda} d_{\lambda,\mu}^L P_\mu^L(z;a,b;t), \tag{6.23}$$

with

$$d_{\lambda,\mu}^L = \frac{\langle \tilde{m}_\lambda, P_\mu^L(.;a,b;t)\rangle_{L,t}^{a,b}}{\langle P_\mu^L(.;a,b;t), P_\mu^L(.;a,b;t)\rangle_{L,t}^{a,b}}.$$

By the induction hypotheses and Proposition 6.3, we have

$$\lim_{k\to\infty} d_{\lambda,\mu}(\epsilon_k) = d_{\lambda,\mu}^L \quad \forall\, \mu < \lambda. \tag{6.24}$$

So (6.21) follows by the induction hypotheses from (6.20), (6.22), (6.23) and (6.24).

The orthogonality relations and the norm evaluations for the little q-Jacobi polynomials follow now from the orthogonality relations and norm evaluations for the Askey-Wilson polynomials with partially discrete orthogonality measure (Theorem 5.7), Proposition 6.3, (6.21) and the observation that

$$\begin{aligned}\lim_{\epsilon\to 0}\left(\prod_{i=1}^n\big(-\epsilon^{-1}qt^{i-1}, -\epsilon^{-1}qat^{i-1};q\big)_\infty\right)&(q^{-1/2}\epsilon)^{2|\lambda|}\mathcal{N}(\lambda;\underline{t}_L(\epsilon);t)\\ &= 2^n n!\big(q;q\big)_\infty^{-2n}(1-q)^{-n}\mathcal{N}^L(\lambda;a,b;t).\end{aligned}$$

□

Full orthogonality of the little q-Jacobi polynomials was proved in [32] by means of an explicit second order q-difference operator D_L which diagonalizes the little q-Jacobi polynomials. The operator D_L and the corresponding eigenvalue equations can be obtained from (6.18) by taking the limit $k \to \infty$ in the equations

$$\big(q^{-1}\epsilon_k\big)^{|\lambda|}\big((D-E_\lambda)P_\lambda\big)\big(q^{\frac{1}{2}}\epsilon_k^{-1}z;\underline{t}_L(\epsilon_k);t\big) = 0 \quad (\lambda \in \Lambda) \tag{6.25}$$

where D is given by (2.16) and E_λ is given by (2.19) (see [32, section 3] for the formal computation of the limits of D and E_λ). In [35] it was shown that the formal computation of the limits of D and E_λ in [32, section 3] can be used to prove the limit transition (6.18) for generic $t \in (0,1)$. See also [33] for the special case that $t = q^k$, $k \in \mathbb{N}$.

The constant term identity for the little q-Jacobi polynomials can be rewritten as follows.

Corollary 6.5. *Let* $t \in (0,1)$ *and* $(a,b) \in V_L$*. We have*

$$\langle 1,1\rangle_{L,t}^{a,b} = \prod_{j=1}^{n} \frac{\Gamma_q(\alpha+1+(j-1)\tau)\Gamma_q(\beta+1+(j-1)\tau)\Gamma_q(j\tau)}{\Gamma_q(\alpha+\beta+2+(n+j-2)\tau)\Gamma_q(\tau)}. \tag{6.26}$$

The constant term identity (6.26) has been studied extensively in recent years. It was conjectured by Askey [4] for $t = q^k$, $k \in \mathbb{N}$ and proved in this case independently by Habsieger [19] and Kadell [21]. For arbitrary $t \in (0,1)$ the first proof appeared in Aomoto's paper [3] (see also [22] and [37] for alternative proofs).

7. Limit transition to big q-Jacobi polynomials

In this section, we consider an other limit transition involving the Askey-Wilson polynomials with positive partially discrete orthogonality measure (Theorem 5.7) for which the continuous part of the orthogonality measure disappears while the completely discrete part of the orthogonality measure blows up to an infinite discrete measure. Instead of sending one parameter to infinity, as we did in the previous section, we will send now two parameters to infinity. We will obtain the four parameter family of big q-Jacobi polynomials (previously introduced in [32]) as limit case of the five parameter family of Askey-Wilson polynomials. The parameter domain for the big q-Jacobi polynomials V_B is defined as follows.

Definition 7.1. *Let* V_B *be the set of parameters* (a,b,c,d) *for which* $c,d>0$ *and* $a \in \big(-c/dq, 1/q\big)$, $b \in \big(-d/cq, 1/q\big)$ *or* $a = cu$, $b = -d\overline{u}$ *with* $u \in \mathbb{C}\setminus\mathbb{R}$.

Before we define the orthogonality measure for the big q-Jacobi polynomials we first need to introduce some more notations. We set

$$\langle \eta, \xi\rangle_n := \bigcup_{j=0}^{n} \langle \xi\rangle_j \times \langle \eta\rangle_{n-j} \subset \mathbb{C}^n$$

where $\eta, \xi \in (\mathbb{C}^*)^n$, $\underline{c} = (c_0,\ldots,c_n) \in (\mathbb{C}^*)^{n+1}$ and $\langle \xi\rangle_n$ is defined by (6.3). Here we use the convention that $\langle\xi\rangle_n \times \langle\eta\rangle_0 = \langle\xi\rangle_n$ and $\langle\xi\rangle_0 \times \langle\eta\rangle_n = \langle\eta\rangle_n$. Define the $\underline{c}$-weighted Jackson integral of f over the set $\langle\eta,\xi\rangle_n$ by

$$\begin{aligned}\iint_{\langle\eta,\xi\rangle_n} f(z)d_q^{\underline{c}}z :=& \sum_{j=0}^{n}(-1)^{n-j}c_j \iint_{z\in\langle\xi\rangle_j}\ \iint_{w\in\langle\eta\rangle_{n-j}} f(z,w)d_qzd_qw\\ =&(1-q)^n\sum_{j=0}^{n}\sum_{\substack{\nu\in P(j)\\ \nu'\in P(n-j)}} c_jf(\xi q^{\nu},\eta q^{\nu'})\prod_{l=1}^{j}\xi_lq^{\nu_l}\prod_{m=1}^{n-j}(-\eta_mq^{\nu'_m}),\end{aligned} \tag{7.1}$$

where the $j=0$ respectively $j=n$ term in (7.1) should be read as

$$(-1)^nc_0\iint_{w\in\langle\eta\rangle_n} f(w)d_qw = (1-q)^n\sum_{\nu'\in P(n)} c_0f(\eta q^{\nu'})\prod_{m=1}^{n}\big(-\eta_mq^{\nu'_m}\big)$$

respectively

$$c_n\iint_{z\in\langle\xi\rangle_n} f(z)d_qz = (1-q)^n\sum_{\nu\in P(n)} c_nf(\xi q^{\nu})\prod_{l=1}^{n}\xi_lq^{\nu_l}.$$

If $\eta = (\eta_1, \eta_1\gamma', \ldots, \eta_1(\gamma')^{n-1})$ and $\xi = (\xi_1, \xi_1\gamma, \ldots, \xi_1\gamma^{n-1})$, then the $\underline{c}$-weighted Jackson integral over $\langle \eta, \xi\rangle_n$ can be rewritten as an iterated Jackson integral by

$$\iint\limits_{\langle \eta,\xi\rangle_n} f(z) d_q^{\underline{c}} z = \sum_{j=0}^{n} c_j \int_{z_1=0}^{\xi_1} \int_{z_2=0}^{\gamma z_1} \cdots \int_{z_j=0}^{\gamma z_{j-1}} \int_{z_{j+1}=\eta_1}^{0} \int_{z_{j+2}=\gamma' z_{j+1}}^{0} \cdots \int_{z_n=\gamma' z_{n-1}}^{0} f(z) d_q z_n \ldots d_q z_1.$$

Define a symmetric bilinear form $\langle ., .\rangle_{B,t}^{a,b,c,d}$ on $A_{\mathbb{R}}^S$ for parameters $t \in (0,1)$ and $(a,b,c,d) \in V_B$ by

$$\langle f, g\rangle_B := \iint\limits_{\langle \sigma_B,\rho_B\rangle_n} f(z)g(z)\Delta^B(z) d_q^{\underline{c}_B} z, \quad f, g \in A_{\mathbb{R}}^S, \tag{7.2}$$

with $\rho_{B,i} := ct^{i-1}$, $\sigma_{B,i} := -dt^{i-1}$ and with weight function

$$\Delta^B(z) := \left(\prod_{i=1}^{n} v_B(z_i)\right) \delta_{qJ}(z), \tag{7.3}$$

where v_B is the weight function in the orthogonality measure for the one-variable big q-Jacobi polynomials [2],

$$v_B(x; a, b, c, d) := \frac{\big(qx/c, -qx/d; q\big)_\infty}{\big(qax/c, -qbx/d; q\big)_\infty} \tag{7.4}$$

and $\delta_{qJ}(z) = \delta_{qJ}(z; t)$ is given by (6.9). The weight $\underline{c}_B$ is of the form $c_{B,j} := c_B d_{B,j}$, with

$$d_{B,j} := \prod_{\substack{1\le k<m\le n\\ k\le j}} \Psi_t(-t^{n-m-k+1} d/c) \tag{7.5}$$

where $\Psi_t(x)$ is defined by

$$\Psi_t(x) := |x|^{2\tau-1} \frac{\theta(tx)}{\theta(qt^{-1}x)} \tag{7.6}$$

with $\theta(x)$ the Jacobi theta function

$$\theta(x) := \big(q, x, qx^{-1}; q\big)_\infty, \tag{7.7}$$

and the constant c_B is defined by

$$c_B := \frac{\big(q; q\big)_\infty^n q^{-2\tau^2\binom{n}{3}} d^{-2\tau\binom{n}{2}-n} t^{-\binom{n}{2}}}{\prod_{i=1}^{n} \theta(-t^{1-i} c/d)}. \tag{7.8}$$

The positive constant c_B is not essential for the definition of $\langle ., .\rangle_B$. We have chosen to take this constant within the definition of $\langle ., .\rangle_B$ because it will simplify formulas and notations later on. The Jacobi theta function satisfies the functional relation

$$\theta(q^k x) = (-x^{-1})^k q^{-\binom{k}{2}} \theta(x), \quad k \in \mathbb{N}_0. \tag{7.9}$$

This implies that Ψ_t is a quasi constant, i.e. $\Psi_t(qx) = \Psi_t(x)$. In particular, the weight $\underline{d}_B$ (7.5) is independent of a, b and quasi constant in the parameters c, d. We note that the bilinear form $\langle ., .\rangle_B$ is the same as the one defined in [32] up to the positive constant c_B (7.8). This is easily verified using the fact that $\langle ., .\rangle_B$ is defined as bilinear form on the space of *symmetric* polynomials.

The weight $\underline{c}_B$ in the definition of $\langle .,. \rangle_B$ is needed in order to obtain good asymptotic behaviour. To be more precise, let $j \in \{1, \ldots, n\}$, $\lambda \in P(j-1)$, $\mu \in P(n-j)$ and set $\lambda^{(l)} := (\lambda, l) \in P(j)$ for $l \geq \lambda_{j-1}$, respectively $\mu^{(m)} := (\mu, m) \in P(n-j+1)$ for $m \geq \mu_{n-j}$. For $j = 1$ respectively $j = n$, this should be read as $\lambda^{(l)} = l \in P(1)$, respectively $\mu^{(m)} = m \in P(1)$. Define

$$\begin{aligned} z^+(l; \lambda, \mu) &:= \bigl(\rho_B q^{\lambda^{(l)}}, \sigma_B q^{\mu}\bigr) \in \langle \rho_B \rangle_j \times \langle \sigma_B \rangle_{n-j} \quad (l \geq \lambda_{j-1}), \\ z^-(m; \lambda, \mu) &:= \bigl(\rho_B q^{\lambda}, \sigma_B q^{\mu^{(m)}}\bigr) \in \langle \rho_B \rangle_{j-1} \times \langle \sigma_B \rangle_{n-j+1} \quad (m \geq \mu_{n-j}), \end{aligned} \tag{7.10}$$

then we have

$$\lim_{l \to \infty} z^+(l; \lambda, \mu) = (\rho_B q^{\lambda}, 0, \sigma_B q^{\mu}), \qquad \lim_{m \to \infty} z^-(m; \lambda, \mu) = (\rho_B q^{\lambda}, \sigma_B q^{\mu}, 0)$$

(with the obvious conventions when $j = 1$ respectively $j = n$). We have now good asymptotic behaviour in the following sense.

Lemma 7.2. *Let $(a, b, c, d) \in V_B$ and $t \in (0, 1)$. Then*

$$\lim_{l \to \infty} c_{B,j} \Delta^B(z^+(l; \lambda, \mu)) = \lim_{m \to \infty} c_{B,j-1} \Delta^B(z^-(m; \lambda, \mu)) \tag{7.11}$$

for all $\lambda \in P(j-1)$, $\mu \in P(n-j)$ and $j \in \{1, \ldots, n\}$. The conditions (7.11) *for $\lambda \in P(j-1)$, $\mu \in P(n-j)$ and $j \in \{1, \ldots, n\}$ characterize the weight $\underline{c}_B$ uniquely up to a constant.*

Proof. See the proof of [32, Theorem 6.5]. □

In [32] it was remarked that $d_{B,j} = 1$ for all $j \in \{1, \ldots, n\}$ if $t = q^k$ with $k \in \mathbb{N}$. For the weight $\underline{c}_B$ we thus have $c_{B,j} = c_B$ for all j if $t = q^k$ with $k \in \mathbb{N}$, and c_B can then be rewritten as

$$c_B = \frac{q^{\binom{k}{2}\binom{n}{2} - k^2\binom{n}{3}} (c+d)^n}{\bigl(-d/c, -c/d; q\bigr)_\infty^n (cd)^{n + \binom{n}{2}k}} \qquad (t = q^k, k \in \mathbb{N}). \tag{7.12}$$

This follows by a straightforward calculation using the relation $\theta(qx^{-1}) = \theta(x)$, (7.9) and

$$\sum_{i=1}^{n} (i-1)^2 = 2\binom{n}{3} + \binom{n}{2}. \tag{7.13}$$

It was proved in [32] that the weights $\Delta^B(z)$ in the bilinear form $\langle .,. \rangle_B$ are strict positive for $z \in \langle \sigma_B, \rho_B \rangle_n$ and that $\langle f, g \rangle_B$, written out as a multidimensional infinite sum over $\langle \sigma_B, \rho_B \rangle_n$, is absolutely convergent for all $f, g \in A_{\mathbb{R}}^S$.

Definition 7.3. *Let $t \in (0, 1)$ and $(a, b, c, d) \in V_B$. The big q-Jacobi polynomials $\{P_\lambda^B(.; a, b, c, d; t)\}_{\lambda \in \Lambda}$ are uniquely defined by the two conditions*
(a) $P_\lambda^B = \tilde{m}_\lambda + \sum_{\mu < \lambda} c_{\lambda,\mu}^B \tilde{m}_\mu$ *for certain constants $c_{\lambda,\mu}^B = c_{\lambda,\mu}^B(a, b, c, d; t) \in \mathbb{R}$;*
(b) $\langle P_\lambda^B, \tilde{m}_\mu \rangle_B = 0$ *for $\mu < \lambda$.*

The following proposition is the analogue of Proposition 6.3 for the big q-Jacobi polynomials.

Proposition 7.4. *Let $t \in (0, 1)$, $(a, b, c, d) \in V_B$ and define for $\epsilon \in \mathbb{R}^*$*

$$\underline{t}_B(\epsilon) := \bigl(\epsilon^{-1}(qc/d)^{\frac{1}{2}}, -\epsilon^{-1}(qd/c)^{\frac{1}{2}}, \epsilon a (qd/c)^{\frac{1}{2}}, -\epsilon b (qc/d)^{\frac{1}{2}}\bigr). \tag{7.14}$$

Then there exists a sequence $\{\epsilon_k\}_{k\in\mathbb{N}_0}$ *in* $\mathbb{R}_{>0}$ *converging to* 0 *such that*

$$\begin{aligned}\lim_{k\to\infty}\left(\prod_{i=1}^{n}\bigl(-\epsilon_k^{-2}qt^{i-1};q\bigr)_{\infty}\right)\bigl(\epsilon_k(cd/q)^{\frac{1}{2}}\bigr)^{|\lambda|+|\mu|}\langle m_\lambda,m_\mu\rangle_{\underline{t}_B(\epsilon_k),t}&\\ =2^nn!\bigl(q;q\bigr)_{\infty}^{-2n}(1-q)^{-n}\langle\tilde{m}_\lambda,\tilde{m}_\mu\rangle_{B,t}^{a,b,c,d}&\end{aligned}\tag{7.15}$$

for all $\lambda,\mu\in\Lambda$*, where* $\langle.,.\rangle_{\underline{t},t}$ *is given by* (5.11).

The proof will be given in section 9. Note that $\underline{t}_B(\epsilon)\in V_{AW}$ for $\epsilon\in\mathbb{R}_{>0}$ sufficiently small, so $\langle.,.\rangle_{\underline{t}_B(\epsilon),t}$ is well defined for $\epsilon>0$ sufficiently small by Lemma 5.5.

We can repeat now the arguments of the previous section to establish full orthogonality of the big q-Jacobi polynomials with respect to $\langle.,.\rangle_B$ and to calculate their norms. For $\lambda\in\Lambda$, $(a,b,c,d)\in V_B$ and $t\in(0,1)$ let $\mathcal{N}^B(\lambda)=\mathcal{N}^B(\lambda;a,b,c,d;t)$ be given by

$$\begin{aligned}\mathcal{N}^B(\lambda):=(cd)^{|\lambda|}q^{\frac{1}{2}\sum_{i=1}^{n}(\lambda_i-1+2(n-i)\tau)\lambda_i}\mathcal{N}_{qJ}^{+}(\lambda;a,b;t)\mathcal{N}_{qJ}^{-}(\lambda;a,b;t)&\\ \cdot\prod_{i=1}^{n}\bigl(-q^{\lambda_i+1}bt^{n-i}c/d,-q^{\lambda_i+1}at^{n-i}d/c;q\bigr)_{\infty}^{-1}&\end{aligned}\tag{7.16}$$

where $t=q^\tau$ and $\mathcal{N}_{qJ}^{+}$ respectively $\mathcal{N}_{qJ}^{-}$ is given by (6.14) respectively (6.15). Note that $\mathcal{N}^B(\lambda)$ is well defined and positive. We have the following theorem.

Theorem 7.5. *Let* $t\in(0,1)$ *and* $(a,b,c,d)\in V_B$*. There exists a sequence* $\{\epsilon_k\}_{k\in\mathbb{N}_0}$ *in* $\mathbb{R}_{>0}$ *converging to* 0 *such that*

$$\lim_{k\to\infty}\Bigl(\epsilon_k(cd/q)^{\frac{1}{2}}\Bigr)^{|\lambda|}P_\lambda\bigl((q/cd)^{\frac{1}{2}}\epsilon_k^{-1}z;\underline{t}_B(\epsilon_k);t\bigr)=P_\lambda^B(z;a,b,c,d;t)\tag{7.17}$$

for all $\lambda\in\Lambda$*. Furthermore, the polynomials* $\{P_\lambda^B\}_{\lambda\in\Lambda}$ *are orthogonal with respect to* $\langle.,.\rangle_B$ *and the quadratic norms of the big q-Jacobi polynomials are given by*

$$\langle P_\lambda^B,P_\lambda^B\rangle_B=\mathcal{N}^B(\lambda),\quad \lambda\in\Lambda.\tag{7.18}$$

Proof. We have the limit

$$\begin{aligned}\lim_{\epsilon\to0}\left(\prod_{i=1}^{n}\bigl(-\epsilon^{-2}qt^{i-1};q\bigr)_{\infty}\right)\bigl((cd/q)^{\frac{1}{2}}\epsilon\bigr)^{2|\lambda|}\mathcal{N}(\lambda;\underline{t}_B(\epsilon);t)&\\ =2^nn!\bigl(q;q\bigr)_{\infty}^{-2n}(1-q)^{-n}\mathcal{N}^B(\lambda;a,b,c,d;t).&\end{aligned}$$

The proof is now analogous to the proof of Theorem 6.4. □

Full orthogonality of the big q-Jacobi polynomials was proved in [32] by studying an explicit second order q-difference operator D_B which diagonalizes the big q-Jacobi polynomials. The operator D_B and the corresponding eigenvalue equations can be obtained from (7.17) by taking the limit $k\to\infty$ in the equations

$$\bigl(\epsilon_k(cd/q)^{\frac{1}{2}}\bigr)^{|\lambda|}\bigl((D-E_\lambda)P_\lambda\bigr)(\epsilon_k^{-1}(q/cd)^{\frac{1}{2}}z;\underline{t}_B(\epsilon_k);t)=0\quad(\lambda\in\Lambda)\tag{7.19}$$

where D is given by (2.16) and E_λ is given by (2.19) (see [32, section 3] for the easy computation). In [35] it was shown that the formal computation of the limits of D and E_λ in [32, section 3] can be used to prove the limit transition (7.17) for generic $t\in(0,1)$. See also [33] for the special case that $t=q^k$, $k\in\mathbb{N}$.

It follows from Theorem 7.5 that D_B is symmetric with respect to $\langle .,. \rangle_B$. In [32] the symmetry of D_B was established by direct calculations in which the asymptotic behaviour of the weight function Δ^B (see Lemma 7.2) plays a crucial role.

The quadratic norm evaluations of the big q-Jacobi polynomials for the special case $a = b = 0$, $c = 1$ and $t = q^k$ with $k \in \mathbb{N}$ are recently proved by Baker and Forrester [7, Section 4.3] using Pieri formulas. In order to see that the quadratic norms of the big q-Jacobi polynomials in this special case are in agreement with the quadratic norm evaluations [7, (4.3)], one needs to use the evaluation formula for the Macdonald polynomials [27, (6.11)] together with [22, Proposition 3.2] and the computation preceding [32, Remark 5.4].

The constant term identity for the big q-Jacobi polynomials can be rewritten as follows.

Corollary 7.6. *Let $t \in (0,1)$ and $(a,b,c,d) \in V_B$. We have*

$$\begin{aligned}\langle 1,1 \rangle_{B,t}^{a,b,c,d} = \prod_{j=1}^{n} \Bigg(& \frac{\Gamma_q(\alpha+1+(j-1)\tau)\Gamma_q(\beta+1+(j-1)\tau)\Gamma_q(j\tau)}{\Gamma_q(\alpha+\beta+2+(n+j-2)\tau)\Gamma_q(\tau)} \\ & . \big(-q^{\alpha+1+(j-1)\tau}d/c, -q^{\beta+1+(j-1)\tau)}c/d; q\big)_{\infty}^{-1} \Bigg)\end{aligned} \tag{7.20}$$

where $a = q^{\alpha}, b = q^{\beta}$ and $t = q^{\tau}$.

The q-Selberg integral (7.20) for $t = q^k$, $k \in \mathbb{N}$ reduces to the following evaluation formula.

Corollary 7.7. *Let $t = q^k$ with $k \in \mathbb{N}$ and $(a,b,c,d) \in V_B$. We have*

$$\begin{aligned} & \int_{z_1=-d}^{c} \cdot\cdot \int_{z_n=-d}^{c} \prod_{1 \le i < j \le n} z_i^{2k} \big(q^{1-k}\frac{z_j}{z_i}; q\big)_{2k} \prod_{i=1}^{n} \frac{\big(qz_i/c, -qz_i/d; q\big)_{\infty}}{\big(q^{1+\alpha}z_i/c, -q^{1+\beta}z_i/d; q\big)_{\infty}} d_q z_i \\ & = q^{k^2\binom{n}{3} - \binom{k}{2}\binom{n}{2}} \prod_{i=1}^{n} \Bigg(\frac{\Gamma_q(\alpha+1+(i-1)k)\Gamma_q(\beta+1+(i-1)k)\Gamma_q(ik+1)}{\Gamma_q(\alpha+\beta+2+(n+i-2)k)\Gamma_q(k+1)} \\ & \qquad . \frac{\big(-d/c, -c/d; q\big)_{\infty}(cd)^{1+(i-1)k}}{\big(-q^{\alpha+1+(i-1)k}d/c, -q^{\beta+1+(i-1)k}c/d; q\big)_{\infty}(c+d)} \Bigg)\end{aligned}$$

where $t = q^{\tau}$, $a = q^{\alpha}$ and $b = q^{\beta}$.

Proof. The bilinear form $\langle .,. \rangle_B$ differs from the one considered in [32, section 5] by the constant c_B, where c_B for $t = q^k$ ($k \in \mathbb{N}$) is given by (7.12). Hence the corollary follows from Corollary 7.6 and the computation preceding [32, Remark 5.4]. □

The constant term identity for the big q-Jacobi polynomials has appeared in the literature before. Corollary 7.7 was conjectured by Askey [4] and proved by Evans [15]. For arbitrary $t \in (0,1)$ the evaluation (7.20) is equivalent to Tarasov's and Varchenko's summation formula [37, Theorem (E.10)] (where the summation over j in (E.10) should be taken from 0 to n). The proof of Tarasov and Varchenko is by computing residues for an A type generalization of Askey-Roy's q-beta integral. The equivalence of [37, Theorem (E.10)] with (7.20) can be seen by making the substitution of variables $p = q$, $x = t$, $a = -d$, $b = c$, $\alpha = -qb/d$, $\beta = qa/c$ and $l = n$ in [37, (E.10)] and by applying the formula

$$\Delta^B(\sigma_B q^{\nu'}, \rho_B q^{\nu}) = \Delta^B(\rho_B q^{\nu}, \sigma_B q^{\nu'}) \prod_{\substack{1 \le k \le j \\ 1 \le m \le n-j}} \psi_t(-t^{m-k}d/c)$$

where $\nu \in P(j)$ and $\nu' \in P(n-j)$ (here ψ_t is given by (7.6)).

8. Proof of Proposition 6.3.

The proof of Proposition 6.3 involves tedious calculations, for which we will give the main steps in this section. We freely use the notations of the previous sections. We fix in this section $(a,b) \in V_L$ with $b \neq 0$. The condition $b \neq 0$ is not essential; with slight modifications, the proof goes also through when $b = 0$.

Let $\epsilon \in \mathbb{R}_{>0}$ and set $\rho_{L,j}(\epsilon) := t_{L,0}(\epsilon)t^{j-1} = \epsilon^{-1}q^{\frac{1}{2}}t^{j-1}$ for $j \in \mathbb{Z}$ (here $\underline{t}_L(\epsilon)$ given by (6.10)). The parameter $t_{L,1}(\epsilon) = -aq^{\frac{1}{2}}$ has modulus > 1 for all ϵ if $a \in \big(q^{-\frac{1}{2}}, q^{-1}\big)$, so can also contribute to the discrete parts of the symmetric form $\langle .,. \rangle_{\underline{t}_L(\epsilon),t}$ (5.11) in the limit (6.11). We therefore write $\sigma_{L,j} := t_{L,1}t^{j-1} = -aq^{\frac{1}{2}}t^{j-1}$ for $j \in \mathbb{Z}$. Then $F(r;\underline{t}_L(\epsilon);t)$ (5.3) for $\epsilon > 0$ sufficiently small is given by

$$F(r;\underline{t}_L(\epsilon);t) = \bigcup_{l+m=r} D_0(l;\underline{t}_L(\epsilon);t) \times D_1(m;\underline{t}_L(\epsilon);t) \subset \mathbb{C}^r$$

with the set $D_0(l;\underline{t}_L(\epsilon);t)$ (5.2) for $l > 0$ given by

$$\begin{aligned} D_0(l;\underline{t}_L(\epsilon);t) &= \{\rho_L(\epsilon)q^{\nu} \mid \nu \in P_L(l;\epsilon)\},\\ P_L(l;\epsilon) &:= \{\nu \in P(l) \mid \quad |\rho_{L,0}(\epsilon)q^{\nu_l}| > 1\} \end{aligned} \tag{8.1}$$

and with the set $D_1(m;\underline{t}_L(\epsilon);t)$ (5.2) for $m > 0$ given by

$$D_1(m;\underline{t}_L(\epsilon);t) = \begin{cases} \{\sigma_L^m\} & \text{if } |\sigma_{L,m}| > 1,\\ \emptyset & \text{otherwise} \end{cases} \tag{8.2}$$

where $\sigma_L^m := (\sigma_{L,1},\ldots,\sigma_{L,m})$. Note in particular, that $D_1(m;\underline{t}_L(\epsilon);t)$ is independent of ϵ. Using the explicit definition of the symmetric form $\langle .,. \rangle$ (5.11) as given in section 4, as well as the definition for $m_\lambda(z|u)$ (6.12), we can write

$$\begin{aligned} &\left(\prod_{i=1}^{n}\big(-\epsilon^{-1}qt^{i-1}, -\epsilon^{-1}qat^{i-1};q\big)_{\infty}\right)\big(\epsilon q^{-1/2}\big)^{|\lambda|+|\mu|}\langle m_\lambda, m_\mu\rangle_{\underline{t}_L(\epsilon),t}\\ &= \sum_{r,l,m,\nu}\iint_{x\in T^{n-r}}\big(m_\lambda m_\mu\big)\big(\rho_L q^{\nu}, \epsilon q^{-\frac{1}{2}}\sigma_L^m, \epsilon q^{-\frac{1}{2}}x|\epsilon q^{-\frac{1}{2}}\big)\mathcal{W}^L_{l,m;r}(\nu,x;\epsilon)\frac{dx}{x} \end{aligned} \tag{8.3}$$

where the sum is over four tuples (r,l,m,ν) with $r \in \{0,\ldots,n\}$, $l,m \in \mathbb{N}_0$ with $l+m=r$, and $\nu \in P(l)$ (the sum over $\nu \in P(l)$ should be ignored when $l=0$). The renormalized weights $\mathcal{W}^L_{l,m;r}(\nu,x;\epsilon)$ are given by $\mathcal{W}^L_{0,0;0}(-;x;\epsilon) := \Delta(x;\underline{t}_L(\epsilon);t)$ for $r=0$, and for $r=1,\ldots,n$,

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{W}^L_{l,m;r}(\nu,x;\epsilon) = &\prod_{i=1}^{n}\big(-\epsilon^{-1}qt^{i-1}, -\epsilon^{-1}qat^{i-1};q\big)_{\infty}\\ &.\frac{2^r\big(n-r+1\big)_r}{(2\pi i)^{n-r}}\Delta_r^{AW}\big(\rho_L(\epsilon)q^{\nu}, \sigma_L^m, x;\underline{t}_L(\epsilon);t\big) \end{aligned}$$

if $\big(\rho_L(\epsilon)q^{\nu}, \sigma_L^m\big) \in F(r;\underline{t}_L(\epsilon);t)$ and zero otherwise. We split the renormalized weights in three parts,

$$\mathcal{W}^L_{l,m;r}(\nu,x;\epsilon) = \frac{2^r\big(n-r+1\big)_r}{(2\pi i)^{n-r}}\Delta^{AWL}_{1,l}(\nu;\epsilon)\Delta^{AWL}_{2,l,m}(\nu;\epsilon)\Delta^{AWL}_{3,l,m}(\nu,x;\epsilon) \tag{8.4}$$

where $\Delta_{1,l}^{AWL}$, $\Delta_{2,l,m}^{AWL}$ and $\Delta_{3,l,m}^{AWL}$ given by

$$\Delta_{1,l}^{AWL}(\nu;\epsilon) := \left(\prod_{i=1}^{l}\bigl(-\epsilon^{-1}qt^{i-1}, -\epsilon^{-1}qat^{i-1};q\bigr)_\infty\right)\Delta^{(d)}\bigl(\rho_L(\epsilon)q^\nu;t_{L,0}(\epsilon)\bigr)$$

if $\nu \in P_L(l;\epsilon)$ and zero otherwise,

$$\Delta_{2,l,m}^{AWL}(\nu;\epsilon) := \prod_{i=1}^{m}\bigl(-\epsilon^{-1}qt^{l+i-1}, -\epsilon^{-1}qat^{l+i-1};q\bigr)_\infty$$
$$.\Delta^{(d)}\bigl(\sigma_L^m;t_{L,1}(\epsilon)\bigr)\delta_c\bigl(\rho_L(\epsilon)q^\nu;\sigma_L^m\bigr)$$

if $\nu \in P_L(l;\epsilon)$, $D_1(m;\underline{t}_L(\epsilon);t) \neq \emptyset$ and zero otherwise,

$$\Delta_{3,l,m}^{AWL}(\nu,x;\epsilon) := \prod_{i=1}^{n-r}\bigl(-\epsilon^{-1}qt^{r+i-1}, -\epsilon^{-1}qat^{r+i-1};q\bigr)_\infty$$
$$.\Delta(x;\underline{t}_L(\epsilon);t)\delta_c\bigl(\rho_L(\epsilon)q^\nu;x)\delta_c(\sigma_L^m;x)$$

if $\nu \in P_L(l;\epsilon), D_1(m;\underline{t}_L(\epsilon);t) \neq \emptyset$ and zero otherwise, where $r = l+m$ and Δ is given by (2.6), $\Delta^{(d)}$ is given by (3.5) and δ_c is given by (3.12). The formula $\delta_c(z;u,v) = \delta_c(z;u)\delta_c(z;v)$ is used for obtaining (8.4). We have used for the definitions of $\Delta_{1,l}^{AWL}$, $\Delta_{2,l,m}^{AWL}$ and $\Delta_{3,l,m}^{AWL}$ the obvious conventions when $l = 0$ or $m = 0$; for instance,

$$\Delta_{2,0,0}^{AWL}(-;\epsilon) = 1, \quad \Delta_{2,l,0}^{AWL}(\nu;\epsilon) := 1$$
$$\Delta_{2,0,m}^{AWL}(-;\epsilon) = \prod_{i=1}^{m}\bigl(-\epsilon^{-1}qt^{i-1}, -\epsilon^{-1}qat^{i-1};q\bigr)_\infty\Delta^{(d)}\bigl(\sigma_L^m;t_{L,1}(\epsilon);t\bigr)$$

for l,m,ν such that $l,m > 0$, $\nu \in P(l;\epsilon)$ and $D(\sigma_L^m;t_{L,1}(\epsilon);t) \neq 0$.

We will use Lebesgue's Dominated Convergence Theorem to pull a limit $\epsilon_k \downarrow 0$ in the right hand side of (8.3) through the integration over $x \in T^{n-r}$ and through the infinite sum over $\nu \in P(l)$ for some sequence $\{\epsilon_k\}_{k\in\mathbb{N}_0}$ in $\mathbb{R}_{>0}$ converging to 0. Therefore, we need certain estimates for the functions $\Delta_{1,l}^{AWL}$, $\Delta_{2,l,m}^{AWL}$ and $\Delta_{3,l,m}^{AWL}$, which we give in the following lemma.

Lemma 8.1. *Keep the notations and conventions as above. In particular, let* $l,m \in \mathbb{N}_0$ *with* $l+m \leq n$, *and write* $r := l+m$. *Then there exists a sequence* $\{\epsilon_k\}_{k\in\mathbb{N}_0}$ *in* $\mathbb{R}_{>0}$ *converging to* 0 *such that*
(i) *if* $l \in \mathbb{N}$, *then for all* $\nu \in P(l)$,

$$\lim_{k\to\infty}\Delta_{1,l}^{AWL}(\nu;\epsilon_k) = \bigl(q;q\bigr)_\infty^{-2l}\Delta^L(\rho_L q^\nu;a,b;t)\prod_{i=1}^{l}\rho_{L,i}q^{\nu_i},$$

and there exists a $K \in \mathbb{R}_{>0}$ *independent of* $\nu \in P(l)$ *such that*

$$\sup_{k\in\mathbb{N}_0}|\Delta_{1,l}^{AWL}(\nu;\epsilon_k)| \leq K\Delta^L\bigl(\rho_L q^\nu;a,b;t)\prod_{i=1}^{l}\rho_{L,i}q^{\nu_i} \tag{8.5}$$

for all $\nu \in P(l)$.
(ii) *if* $m \in \mathbb{N}$, *then* $\lim_{k\to\infty}\Delta_{2,l,m}^{AWL}(\nu;\epsilon_k) = 0$ *for all* $\nu \in P(l)$ *and*

$$\sup_{(\nu,k)\in P(l)\times\mathbb{N}_0}|\Delta_{2,l,m}^{AWL}(\nu;\epsilon_k)| < \infty.$$

(iii) *if* $r<n$*, then* $\lim_{k\to\infty}\Delta_{3,l,m}^{AWL}(\nu,x;\epsilon_k)=0$ *for all* $x\in T^{n-r}$*,* $\nu\in P(l)$ *and*

$$\sup_{(\nu,x,k)\in P(l)\times T^{n-r}\times\mathbb{N}_0}|\Delta_{3,l,m}^{AWL}(\nu,x;\epsilon_k)|<\infty.$$

Before we prove Lemma 8.1, we complete the proof of Proposition 6.3. As we have already remarked in section 5, we have that the infinite sum

$$(1-q)^{-n}\langle 1,1\rangle_{L,t}^{a,b}=\sum_{\nu\in P(n)}\Delta^L(\rho_Lq^\nu;a,b;t)\prod_{i=1}^n\rho_{L,i}q^{\nu_i}\tag{8.6}$$

is absolutely convergent (cf. [32, proof of Proposition 6.1]) and we have

$$\sup_{\nu,\epsilon,x}|m_\lambda\big(\rho_Lq^\nu,\epsilon q^{-\frac{1}{2}}\sigma_L^m,\epsilon q^{-\frac{1}{2}}x|\epsilon q^{-\frac{1}{2}}\big)|<\infty\quad(\lambda\in\Lambda),$$

where the supremum is taken over triples (ν,ϵ,x) with $\nu\in P_L(l;\epsilon)$, $\epsilon\in\mathbb{R}_{>0}$ and $x\in T^{n-r}$. By Lebesgue's Dominated Convergence Theorem, (6.13), (8.3), (8.4) and Lemma 8.1 we thus obtain

$$\begin{aligned}\lim_{k\to\infty}&\left(\prod_{i=1}^n\big(-\epsilon_k^{-1}qt^{i-1},-\epsilon_k^{-1}qat^{i-1};q\big)_\infty\right)\big(\epsilon_kq^{-\frac{1}{2}}\big)^{|\lambda|+|\mu|}\langle m_\lambda,m_\mu\rangle_{\underline{t}_L(\epsilon_k),t}\\
&=\sum_{r,l,m,\nu}\iint_{x\in T^{n-r}}\lim_{k\to\infty}\big(m_\lambda m_\mu\big)\big(\rho_Lq^\nu,\epsilon_kq^{-\frac{1}{2}}\sigma_L^m,\epsilon_kq^{-\frac{1}{2}}x|\epsilon_kq^{-\frac{1}{2}}\big)\mathcal{W}_{l,m;r}^L(\nu,x;\epsilon_k)\frac{dx}{x}\\
&=2^nn!\big(q;q\big)_\infty^{-2n}\sum_{\nu\in P(n)}\big(\tilde{m}_\lambda\tilde{m}_\mu\big)(\rho_Lq^\nu)\Delta^L(\rho_Lq^\nu;a,b;t)\prod_{i=1}^n\rho_{L,i}q^{\nu_i}\\
&=2^nn!(1-q)^{-n}\big(q;q\big)_\infty^{-2n}\langle\tilde{m}_\lambda,\tilde{m}_\mu\rangle_{L,t}^{a,b}\end{aligned}$$

for some sequence $\{\epsilon_k\}_{k\in\mathbb{N}_0}$ in $\mathbb{R}_{>0}$ converging to 0, where the sum in the second line is over four tuples (r,l,m,ν) with $r\in\{0,\ldots,n\}$, $l,m\in\mathbb{N}_0$ with $l+m=r$, and $\nu\in P(l)$. So for the proof of Proposition 6.3, it suffices to prove Lemma 8.1. We use the following elementary lemma.

Lemma 8.2. [36, Lemma 3.1] *For given* $\epsilon_0\in\mathbb{R}_{>0}$*, we set* $\epsilon_k:=\epsilon_0q^k$*.*
(a) *Let* $c\in\mathbb{C}$*. For* $\epsilon_0\in\mathbb{R}_{>0}$ *with* $|c|\epsilon_0\not\in\{q^{-l}\}_{l\in\mathbb{N}_0}$ *there exist positive constants* $K^\pm>0$ *which only depend on* ϵ_0 *and* $|c|$*, such that* $K^-\leq|\big(c\epsilon_k;q\big)_\infty|\leq K^+$ *for all* $k\in\mathbb{N}_0$*. Furthermore, we have* $\lim_{k\to\infty}\big(c\epsilon_k;q\big)_\infty=1$*.*
(b) *Let* $a,b\in\mathbb{C}^*$*, and set*

$$f_{\{l,m\}}(\epsilon;a,b):=\frac{\big(\epsilon^{-1}aq^{1-m};q\big)_m}{\big(\epsilon^{-1}bq^{1-m-l};q\big)_m},\qquad(l,m\in\mathbb{N}_0).\tag{8.7}$$

Let $\epsilon_0\in\mathbb{R}_{>0}$ *such that* $\epsilon_0^{-1}|b|\not\in\{q^k\}_{k\in\mathbb{N}_0}$*. Then there exists a positive constant* $K>0$ *which depends only on* ϵ_0*,* $|a|$ *and* $|b|$*, such that* $|f_{\{l,m\}}(\epsilon_k;a,b)|\leq K|q^la/b|^m$ *for all* $k,l,m\in\mathbb{N}_0$*. Furthermore, we have* $\lim_{k\to\infty}f_{\{l,m\}}(\epsilon_k;a,b)=(q^la/b)^m$*.*
(c) *Let* $u_i,v_j\in\mathbb{C}^*$ *for* $i\in\{1,\ldots,r\}$*,* $j\in\{1,\ldots,s\}$ *and assume that* $r<s$*, or that* $r=s$ *and* $|u_1\ldots u_r|<|v_1\ldots v_r|$*. Set*

$$g(\epsilon):=\frac{\big(\epsilon^{-1}u_1,\ldots,\epsilon^{-1}u_r;q\big)_\infty}{\big(\epsilon^{-1}v_1,\ldots,\epsilon^{-1}v_s;q\big)_\infty}.\tag{8.8}$$

Let $\epsilon_0 \in \mathbb{R}_{>0}$ *such that* $\epsilon_0^{-1}|v_j| \notin \{q^l\}_{l\in\mathbb{Z}}$ *for* $j \in \{1,\ldots,s\}$*. Then there exist a positive constant* $K > 0$ *which depends only on* ϵ_0*,* $|u_i|$ *and* $|v_j|$*, such that* $\sup_{k\in\mathbb{N}_0} |g(\epsilon_k)| \le K$*. Furthermore, we have* $\lim_{k\to\infty} g(\epsilon_k) = 0$*.*

The proofs of **(b)** and **(c)** are based on the formula (4.3) for q-shifted factorials. See [36, Lemma 3.1] for details.

We proceed with the proof of Lemma 8.1. We use the notation $\epsilon_k := \epsilon_0 q^k$ for given $\epsilon_0 \in \mathbb{R}_{>0}$.

(i) By (3.5) one has

$$\begin{aligned}\Delta_{1,l}^{AWL}(\nu;\epsilon) &= \delta_d(\rho_L(\epsilon)q^\nu)\\ &\cdot\prod_{i=1}^{l}\Big(\big(-\epsilon^{-1}qt^{i-1}, -\epsilon^{-1}qat^{i-1};q\big)_\infty w_d(\rho_{L,i}(\epsilon)q^{\nu_i};\rho_{L,i}(\epsilon)q^{\nu_{i-1}})\Big)\end{aligned} \tag{8.9}$$

with δ_d given by (3.7) and w_d given by (3.9). By (3.7) and (6.10), we have

$$\delta_d(\rho_L(\epsilon)q^\nu) = F_1(\nu)G_1(\nu;\epsilon) \tag{8.10}$$

with

$$\begin{aligned}F_1(\nu) &:= \prod_{1\le i<j\le l}\frac{\big(t^{j-i}q^{\nu_j-\nu_i};q\big)_\tau}{\big(t^{i-j}q^{\nu_{i-1}-\nu_j};q\big)_{\nu_i-\nu_{i-1}}},\\ G_1(\nu;\epsilon) &:= \prod_{1\le i<j\le l}\frac{\big(\epsilon^2t^{2-i-j}q^{-\nu_i-\nu_j-1};q\big)_\tau}{\big(\epsilon^{-2}t^{i+j-2}q^{\nu_{i-1}+\nu_j+1};q\big)_{\nu_i-\nu_{i-1}}},\end{aligned} \tag{8.11}$$

for $\nu \in P(l)$, where $\nu_0 = 0$ and $t = q^\tau$. By applying (4.3) to the q-shifted factorials in the denominator of F_1 and using the formula

$$\sum_{i=1}^{l}(i-1)(l-i) = \binom{l}{3}, \tag{8.12}$$

we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}F_1(\nu) =&\delta_{qJ}(\rho_Lq^\nu)q^{-2\tau^2\binom{l}{3}}\prod_{j=1}^{l}\frac{\big(t^{j-1}q^{\nu_j+1};q\big)_\infty}{\big(q^{\nu_j-\nu_{j-1}+1};q\big)_\infty}t^{-2(l-j)\nu_j}\\ &\cdot\prod_{1\le i<j\le l}\big(-q^{\nu_j-\nu_i+1}t^{j-i}\big)^{\nu_i-\nu_{i-1}}q^{\binom{\nu_i-\nu_{i-1}}{2}},\end{aligned} \tag{8.13}$$

where δ_{qJ} (6.9) is the interaction factor for the weight function of the little q-Jacobi polynomials. On the other hand, we have for $i = 1,\ldots,l$ by (3.9),

$$\big(-\epsilon^{-1}qt^{i-1}, -\epsilon^{-1}qat^{i-1};q\big)_\infty w_d(\rho_{L,i}(\epsilon)q^{\nu_i};\rho_{L,i}(\epsilon)q^{\nu_{i-1}}) = I_{1,i}(\nu)J_{1,i}(\nu;\epsilon) \tag{8.14}$$

with

$$\begin{aligned}I_{1,i}(\nu) &:= \frac{\big(t^{i-1}q^{\nu_{i-1}+1}ab\big)^{\nu_{i-1}-\nu_i}}{\big(q, qbt^{i-1}q^{\nu_i};q\big)_\infty\big(q;q\big)_{\nu_i-\nu_{i-1}}}\\ &= \upsilon_L(\rho_{L,i}q^{\nu_i})\frac{a^{(1-i)\tau-\nu_i}\big(t^{i-1}q^{\nu_{i-1}+1}ab\big)^{\nu_{i-1}-\nu_i}}{\big(q, t^{i-1}q^{\nu_i+1};q\big)_\infty\big(q;q\big)_{\nu_i-\nu_{i-1}}}\end{aligned}$$

(here v_L (6.8) is the one-variable weight function of the little q-Jacobi polynomials) and with $J_{1,i}(\nu;\epsilon)$ given by

$$\begin{aligned} J_{1,i}(\nu;\epsilon) :=& \frac{\big(\epsilon^2 t^{2-2i}q^{-2\nu_{i-1}-1};q\big)_\infty}{\big(\epsilon^2 bt^{1-i}q^{-\nu_{i-1}}, -\epsilon t^{1-i}q^{-\nu_{i-1}}, -\epsilon a t^{1-i}q^{-\nu_{i-1}};q\big)_\infty} \\ &\cdot \frac{\big(\epsilon^{-2}q^{1+2\nu_{i-1}}t^{2i-2};q\big)_{\nu_i-\nu_{i-1}}\big(-\epsilon^{-1}t^{i-1}q;q\big)_{\nu_{i-1}}\big(-\epsilon^{-1}at^{i-1}q;q\big)_{\nu_i}}{\big(\epsilon^{-2}b^{-1}t^{i-1}q^{\nu_{i-1}+1}, -\epsilon^{-1}a^{-1}t^{i-1}q^{\nu_{i-1}+1};q\big)_{\nu_i-\nu_{i-1}}} \\ &\cdot \frac{\big(1-\epsilon^{-2}q^{1+2\nu_i}t^{2i-2}\big)}{\big(1-\epsilon^{-2}q^{1+2\nu_{i-1}}t^{2i-2}\big)}. \end{aligned}$$

So we have by (8.9), (8.10), (8.13) and (8.14), $\Delta_{1,l}^{AWL}(\nu;\epsilon) = M_1(\nu)N_1(\nu;\epsilon)$ for $\epsilon \in \mathbb{R}_{>0}$ and $\nu \in P_L(l;\epsilon)$ with

$$\begin{aligned} M_1(\nu) :=& F_1(\nu)\prod_{i=1}^{l} I_{1,i}(\nu) \\ =& \Delta^L(\rho_L q^\nu)\big(q;q\big)_\infty^{-2l} t^{\binom{l}{2}} \prod_{i=1}^{l}\big(t^{-2(l-i)}a^{-1}\big)^{\nu_i}\big(t^{i-1}q^{\nu_{i-1}+1}ab\big)^{\nu_{i-1}-\nu_i} \\ &\cdot \prod_{1\le i<j\le l}\big(-q^{\nu_j-\nu_i+1}t^{j-i}\big)^{\nu_i-\nu_{i-1}} q^{\binom{\nu_i-\nu_{i-1}}{2}}, \end{aligned} \tag{8.15}$$

(Δ^L given by (6.7)) and with

$$N_1(\nu;\epsilon) := G_1(\nu;\epsilon)\prod_{i=1}^{l} J_{1,i}(\nu;\epsilon).$$

Now replace the factor $\big(-\epsilon^{-1}at^{i-1}q;q\big)_{\nu_i}$ in $J_{1,i}(\nu;\epsilon)$ by

$$\big(-\epsilon^{-1}at^{i-1}q^{\nu_{i-1}+1};q\big)_{\nu_i-\nu_{i-1}}\big(-\epsilon^{-1}at^{i-1}q;q\big)_{\nu_{i-1}}$$

for $i \in \{1,\ldots,l\}$, then $N_1(\nu;\epsilon)$ can explicitly be given by

$$N_1(\nu;\epsilon) = N_1^1(\nu;\epsilon)N_1^2(\nu;\epsilon)N_1^3(\nu;\epsilon) \tag{8.16}$$

with

$$\begin{aligned} N_1^1(\nu;\epsilon) :=& \prod_{i=1}^{l}\frac{\big(\epsilon^2 t^{2-2i}q^{-2\nu_{i-1}-1};q\big)_\infty}{\big(\epsilon^2 bt^{1-i}q^{-\nu_{i-1}}, -\epsilon t^{1-i}q^{-\nu_{i-1}}, -\epsilon a t^{1-i}q^{-\nu_{i-1}};q\big)_\infty} \\ &\cdot \prod_{1\le i<j\le l}\big(\epsilon^2 t^{2-i-j}q^{-\nu_i-\nu_j-1};q\big)_\tau \end{aligned} \tag{8.17}$$

if $\nu \in P_L(l;\epsilon)$ and zero otherwise,

$$\begin{aligned} N_1^2(\nu;\epsilon) := \prod_{i=1}^{l}\Bigg(& \frac{\big(\epsilon^{-2}q^{1+2\nu_{i-1}}t^{2i-2}, -\epsilon^{-1}at^{i-1}q^{1+\nu_{i-1}};q\big)_{\nu_i-\nu_{i-1}}}{\big(\epsilon^{-2}b^{-1}t^{i-1}q^{1+\nu_{i-1}}, -\epsilon^{-1}a^{-1}t^{i-1}q^{1+\nu_{i-1}};q\big)_{\nu_i-\nu_{i-1}}} \\ &\cdot \frac{\big(\epsilon^{-2}q^{1+2\nu_i}t^{2i-2};q\big)_1}{\big(\epsilon^{-2}q^{1+2\nu_{i-1}}t^{2i-2};q\big)_1}\Bigg) \end{aligned} \tag{8.18}$$

if $\nu \in P_L(l;\epsilon)$ and zero otherwise, and

$$N_1^3(\nu;\epsilon) = \frac{\prod_{i=1}^{l}\bigl(-\epsilon^{-1}t^{i-1}q, -\epsilon^{-1}at^{i-1}q; q\bigr)_{\nu_{i-1}}}{\prod_{1\le i<j\le l}\bigl(\epsilon^{-2}t^{i+j-2}q^{\nu_{i-1}+\nu_j+1}; q\bigr)_{\nu_i-\nu_{i-1}}} \tag{8.19}$$

if $\nu \in P_L(l;\epsilon)$ and zero otherwise. For the factor N_1^1 we have for generic $\epsilon_0 > 0$,

$$\lim_{k\to\infty} N_1^1(\nu;\epsilon_k) = 1 \qquad (\nu \in P(l)) \tag{8.20}$$

by Lemma 8.2**(a)**. For the factor N_1^2 we can use Lemma 8.2**(b)** to calculate the limit. We obtain for generic $\epsilon_0 > 0$,

$$\lim_{k\to\infty} N_1^2(\nu;\epsilon_k) = \prod_{i=1}^{l}\bigl(q^{\nu_{i-1}+2}t^{i-1}a^2b\bigr)^{\nu_i-\nu_{i-1}} \tag{8.21}$$

for all $\nu \in P(l)$. As an example, let us calculate explicitly the limit of a factor of N_1^2, using Lemma 8.2**(b)**. Consider the factor

$$N_1^{i,2}(\nu;\epsilon) := \frac{\bigl(\epsilon^{-2}q^{1+2\nu_{i-1}}t^{2i-2}; q\bigr)_{\nu_i-\nu_{i-1}}}{\bigl(\epsilon^{-2}q^{1+\nu_{i-1}}b^{-1}t^{i-1}; q\bigr)_{\nu_i-\nu_{i-1}}} \tag{8.22}$$

of $N_1^2(\nu;\epsilon)$ for some $i \in \{1,\ldots,l\}$. Then for generic $\epsilon_0 > 0$, we obtain by Lemma 8.2**(b)**,

$$\begin{aligned}\lim_{k\to\infty} N_1^{i,2}(\nu;\epsilon_k) &= \lim_{k\to\infty} N_1^{i,2}(\nu;\epsilon_{k+\nu_l})\\ &= \lim_{k\to\infty} N_1^{i,2}(\nu;q^{\nu_l}\epsilon_k)\\ &= \lim_{k\to\infty} f_{\{\nu_{i-1},\nu_i-\nu_{i-1}\}}\bigl(\epsilon_{2\nu_l-\nu_i-\nu_{i-1}+2k}; \epsilon_0^{-1}t^{2i-2}, \epsilon_0^{-1}b^{-1}t^{i-1}\bigr)\\ &= \bigl(q^{\nu_{i-1}}t^{i-1}b\bigr)^{\nu_i-\nu_{i-1}}.\end{aligned} \tag{8.23}$$

Similarly, one deals with the other factors of N_1^2 and one obtains (8.21). Finally, we have for generic $\epsilon_0 > 0$,

$$\begin{aligned}\lim_{k\to\infty} N_1^3(\nu;\epsilon_k) =& \prod_{i=1}^{l}\bigl(at^{2(i-1)}q^{\nu_{i-1}+1}\bigr)^{\nu_{i-1}}\\ &\cdot \prod_{1\le i<j\le l}\bigl(-t^{i+j-2}q^{\nu_{i-1}+\nu_j+1}\bigr)^{\nu_{i-1}-\nu_i}q^{-\binom{\nu_i-\nu_{i-1}}{2}}\end{aligned} \tag{8.24}$$

since

$$\sum_{i=1}^{l}\nu_{i-1} = \sum_{1\le i<j\le l}(\nu_i-\nu_{i-1}) \qquad (\nu \in P(l)). \tag{8.25}$$

We thus obtain for generic $\epsilon_0 > 0$ by (8.16), (8.20), (8.21) and (8.24),

$$\begin{aligned}\lim_{k\to\infty} N_1(\nu;\epsilon_k) =& \prod_{i=1}^{l} t^{(i-1)(\nu_i+\nu_{i-1})}q^{\nu_{i-1}\nu_i-\nu_{i-1}+2\nu_i}a^{2\nu_i-\nu_{i-1}}b^{\nu_i-\nu_{i-1}}\\ &\cdot \prod_{1\le i<j\le l}\bigl(-t^{i+j-2}q^{\nu_{i-1}+\nu_j+1}\bigr)^{\nu_{i-1}-\nu_i}q^{-\binom{\nu_i-\nu_{i-1}}{2}}\end{aligned} \tag{8.26}$$

for all $\nu \in P(l)$. By (8.15) and (8.26) we obtain for generic $\epsilon_0 > 0$,

$$\begin{aligned}\lim_{k\to\infty} \Delta_{1,l}^{AWL}(\nu;\epsilon_k) &= M_1(\nu) \lim_{k\to\infty} N_1(\nu;\epsilon_k)\\ &= \big(q;q\big)_\infty^{-2l} \Delta^L(\rho_L q^\nu) t^{\binom{l}{2}} q^{|\nu|}\\ &= \big(q;q\big)_\infty^{-2l} \Delta^L(\rho_L q^\nu) \prod_{i=1}^{l} \rho_{L,i} q^{\nu_i}\end{aligned}$$

for all $\nu \in P(l)$, where Δ^L is given by (6.7) and $|\nu| := \nu_1 + \cdots + \nu_l$ for $\nu \in P(l)$.

To prove the estimate (8.5), we use the estimates of Lemma 8.2 **(a)** and **(b)** for (factors of) N_1. For N_1^1, we use Lemma 8.2**(a)** and the condition that $N_1^1(\nu;\epsilon) = 0$ if $\nu \notin P_L(l;\epsilon)$ to prove that $\sup_{\nu,k} |N_1^1(\nu;\epsilon_k)| < \infty$ for generic $\epsilon_0 > q^{\frac{1}{2}}$. Indeed, since $\nu \in P_L(l;\epsilon)$ implies $\epsilon < q^{\frac{1}{2}+\nu_l}$, we have for $\epsilon_0 > q^{\frac{1}{2}}$,

$$\sup_{(\nu,k)\in P(l)\times\mathbb{N}_0} |N_1^1(\nu;\epsilon_k)| = \sup_{(\nu,k)\in P(l)\times\mathbb{N}_0} |N_1^1(\nu;\epsilon_k q^{\nu_l})| < \infty \tag{8.27}$$

by (8.17) and Lemma 8.2**(a)**.

For $N_1^2(\nu;\epsilon)$ we want to establish the estimate

$$\sup_{k\in\mathbb{N}_0} |N_1^2(\nu;\epsilon_k)| \leq K_1^2 \prod_{i=1}^{l} \big(q^{\nu_{i-1}+2} t^{i-1} a^2 |b|\big)^{\nu_i-\nu_{i-1}} \tag{8.28}$$

for generic $\epsilon_0 > q^{\frac{1}{2}}$ with $K_1^2 > 0$ independent of $\nu \in P(l)$, in view of the limit (8.21). This can be done with the help of Lemma 8.2**(b)**. As an example, we consider the factor $N_1^{i,2}(\nu;\epsilon)$ (8.22). In view of the limit (8.23), we want to prove the estimate

$$\sup_{k\in\mathbb{N}_0} |N_1^{i,2}(\nu;\epsilon_k)| \leq K_1^{i,2} \big(q^{\nu_{i-1}} t^{i-1} |b|\big)^{\nu_i-\nu_{i-1}}$$

for generic $\epsilon_0 > q^{\frac{1}{2}}$ with $K_1^{i,2} > 0$ independent of $\nu \in P(l)$. This follows for generic $\epsilon_0 > q^{\frac{1}{2}}$, using the fact that $N_1^{i,2}(\nu;\epsilon) = 0$ if $\nu \notin P_L(l;\epsilon)$, by the estimates

$$\begin{aligned}\sup_{k\in\mathbb{N}_0} |N_1^{i,2}(\nu;\epsilon_k)| &= \sup_{k\in\mathbb{N}_0} |N_1^{i,2}(\nu;q^{\nu_l}\epsilon_k)|\\ &= \sup_{k\in\mathbb{N}_0} |f_{\{\nu_{i-1},\nu_i-\nu_{i-1}\}}\big(\epsilon_{2\nu_l-\nu_i-\nu_{i-1}+2k}; \epsilon_0^{-1}t^{2i-2}, \epsilon_0^{-1}b^{-1}t^{i-1}\big)|\\ &\leq \sup_{k\in\mathbb{N}_0} |f_{\{\nu_{i-1},\nu_i-\nu_{i-1}\}}\big(\epsilon_k; \epsilon_0^{-1}t^{2i-2}, \epsilon_0^{-1}b^{-1}t^{i-1}\big)|\\ &\leq K_1^{i,2}\big(q^{\nu_{i-1}}t^{i-1}|b|\big)^{\nu_i-\nu_{i-1}}\end{aligned}$$

with $K_1^{i,2}$ independent of ν by Lemma 8.2**(b)**. Similarly, one deals with the other factors.

For N_1^3, we want to prove that

$$\begin{aligned}\sup_{k\in\mathbb{N}_0} |N_1^3(\nu;\epsilon_k)| \leq& K_1^3 \prod_{i=1}^{l} \big(at^{2(i-1)} q^{\nu_{i-1}+1}\big)^{\nu_{i-1}}\\ &\cdot \prod_{1\leq i<j\leq l} \big(t^{i+j-2} q^{\nu_{i-1}+\nu_j+1}\big)^{\nu_{i-1}-\nu_i} q^{-\binom{\nu_i-\nu_{i-1}}{2}}\end{aligned} \tag{8.29}$$

for generic $\epsilon_0 > q^{\frac{1}{2}}$ with $K_1^3 > 0$ independent of $\nu \in P(l)$, in view of the limit (8.24). This follows by straightforward estimates, using (4.3) and the fact that

$N_1^3(\nu;\epsilon)=0$ if $\nu\notin P_L(l;\epsilon)$. Hence by (8.16), (8.27), (8.28) and (8.29) we have the estimate

$$\begin{aligned}\sup_{k\in\mathbb{N}_0}|N_1(\nu;\epsilon_k)|\leq &K_1\prod_{i=1}^{l}t^{(i-1)(\nu_i+\nu_{i-1})}q^{\nu_{i-1}\nu_i-\nu_{i-1}+2\nu_i}a^{2\nu_i-\nu_{i-1}}|b|^{\nu_i-\nu_{i-1}}\\ &\cdot\prod_{1\leq i<j\leq l}\big(t^{i+j-2}q^{\nu_{i-1}+\nu_j+1}\big)^{\nu_{i-1}-\nu_i}q^{-\binom{\nu_i-\nu_{i-1}}{2}}\end{aligned}\tag{8.30}$$

for generic $\epsilon_0>q^{\frac{1}{2}}$, with $K_1>0$ independent of $\nu\in P(l)$, so in particular,

$$\sup_{k\in\mathbb{N}_0}|\Delta_{1,l}^{AWL}(\nu;\epsilon_k)|=|M_1(\nu)|\sup_{k\in\mathbb{N}_0}|N_1(\nu;\epsilon_k)|\leq K\Delta^L(\rho_Lq^\nu)\prod_{i=1}^{l}\rho_{L,i}q^{\nu_i}$$

with $K>0$ independent of $\nu\in P(l)$. This completes the proof of **(i)**.
For **(ii)**, note that $\delta_c(\rho_L(\epsilon);\sigma_L^m)$ (δ_c given by (3.12)) can be rewritten as

$$\begin{aligned}\delta_c(\rho_L(\epsilon)q^\nu;\sigma_L^m)=&\prod_{\substack{1\leq i\leq l\\1\leq j\leq m}}\big(-\epsilon aq^{-\nu_i}t^{j-i},-\epsilon a^{-1}q^{-1-\nu_i}t^{2-i-j};q\big)_\tau\\ &\cdot\prod_{j=1}^{m}\frac{\big(-\epsilon^{-1}aqt^{j-1},-\epsilon^{-1}a^{-1}t^{1-j};q\big)_\infty}{\big(-\epsilon^{-1}aqt^{l+j-1},-\epsilon^{-1}a^{-1}t^{l-j+1};q\big)_\infty}\\ &\cdot\prod_{\substack{0\leq i\leq l-1\\1\leq j\leq m}}\frac{\big(-\epsilon^{-1}aq^{1+\nu_i}t^{l+j-1},-\epsilon^{-1}a^{-1}q^{\nu_i}t^{l-j+1};q\big)_{\nu_{i+1}-\nu_i}}{\big(-\epsilon^{-1}aq^{1+\nu_i}t^{i+j-1},-\epsilon^{-1}a^{-1}q^{\nu_i}t^{i-j+1};q\big)_{\nu_{i+1}-\nu_i}}\end{aligned}\tag{8.31}$$

where $\nu_0=0$ and $t=q^\tau$. By the explicit expression for $\Delta^{(d)}$ (3.5) and for the parameters $\underline{t}_L(\epsilon)$ (6.10) we then obtain

$$\Delta_{2,l,m}^{AWL}(\nu;\epsilon)=N_2^1N_2^2(\nu;\epsilon)N_2^3(\epsilon)N_2^4(\nu;\epsilon)\tag{8.32}$$

with

$$N_2^1:=\prod_{i=1}^{m}\frac{\big(a^{-2}q^{-1}t^{2(1-i)};q\big)_\infty}{\big(q,aqt^{i-1},a^{-1}t^{1-i};q\big)_\infty}\prod_{1\leq i<j\leq m}\big(t^{j-i},a^{-2}t^{2-i-j}q^{-1};q\big)_\tau,$$

$$N_2^2(\nu;\epsilon):=\prod_{j=1}^{m}\frac{\prod_{i=1}^{l}\big(-\epsilon aq^{-\nu_i}t^{j-i},-\epsilon a^{-1}q^{-1-\nu_i}t^{2-i-j};q\big)_\tau}{\big(-\epsilon a^{-1}bt^{1-j},-\epsilon abqt^{j-1};q\big)_\infty}$$

if $\nu\in P_L(l;\epsilon)$ and zero otherwise,

$$N_2^3(\epsilon):=\prod_{j=1}^{m}\frac{\big(-\epsilon^{-1}t^{l+j-1}q;q\big)_\infty}{\big(-\epsilon^{-1}t^{l-j+1}a^{-1};q\big)_\infty},$$

$$N_2^4(\nu;\epsilon):=\prod_{\substack{0\leq i\leq l-1\\1\leq j\leq m}}\frac{\big(-\epsilon^{-1}aq^{1+\nu_i}t^{l+j-1},-\epsilon^{-1}a^{-1}q^{\nu_i}t^{l-j+1};q\big)_{\nu_{i+1}-\nu_i}}{\big(-\epsilon^{-1}aq^{1+\nu_i}t^{i+j-1},-\epsilon^{-1}a^{-1}q^{\nu_i}t^{i-j+1};q\big)_{\nu_{i+1}-\nu_i}}$$

if $\nu\in P_L(l;\epsilon)$ and zero otherwise. We have for generic $\epsilon_0>q^{\frac{1}{2}}$,

$$\lim_{k\to\infty}N_2^2(\nu;\epsilon_k)=1,\qquad\sup_{(\nu,k)\in P(l)\times\mathbb{N}_0}|N_2^2(\nu;\epsilon_k)|<\infty$$

by Lemma 8.2**(a)** and by the fact that $N_2^2(\nu;\epsilon)=0$ if $\nu\not\in P_L(l;\epsilon)$,

$$\lim_{k\to\infty}N_2^3(\epsilon_k)=0,\quad \sup_{k\in\mathbb{N}_0}|N_2^3(\epsilon_k)|<\infty$$

by Lemma 8.2**(c)** since $0<a<1/q$, and

$$\lim_{k\to\infty}N_2^4(\nu;\epsilon_k)=t^{2m|\nu|},\quad \sup_{k\in\mathbb{N}_0}|N_2^4(\nu;\epsilon_k)|\le K_2^4t^{2m|\nu|}\le K_2^4$$

with $K_2^4>0$ independent of $\nu\in P(l)$ by Lemma 8.2**(b)** and by the fact that $N_2^4(\nu;\epsilon)=0$ if $\nu\not\in P_L(l;\epsilon)$. This completes the proof of **(ii)**. Remains to prove **(iii)**. We can use the explicit formulas for the weight function Δ (2.6), (2.7), (2.8) and for δ_c (3.12) as well as the definition of $\underline{t}_L(\epsilon)$ (6.10) to give an explicit expression for $\Delta_{3,l,m}^{AWL}(\nu,x;\epsilon)$. This explicit expression can be written as

$$\Delta_{3,l,m}^{AWL}(\nu,x;\epsilon)=N_3^1(x)N_3^2(\nu,x;\epsilon)N_3^3(x;\epsilon)N_3^4(\nu,x;\epsilon)$$

with

$$N_3^1(x):=\delta(x;t)\delta_c(\sigma_L^m;x)\prod_{i=1}^{n-r}\frac{\bigl(x_i^2,x_i^{-2};q\bigr)_\infty}{\bigl(-q^{\frac{1}{2}}x_i,-q^{\frac{1}{2}}x_i^{-1},-q^{\frac{1}{2}}ax_i,-q^{\frac{1}{2}}ax_i^{-1};q\bigr)_\infty},\tag{8.33}$$

if $D_1(m;\underline{t}_L(\epsilon);t)\neq0$ or $m=0$ and zero otherwise, where δ is given by (2.8),

$$N_3^2(\nu,x;\epsilon):=\prod_{j=1}^{n-r}\frac{\prod_{i=1}^l\bigl(\epsilon q^{-\frac{1}{2}-\nu_i}t^{1-i}x_j,\epsilon q^{-\frac{1}{2}-\nu_i}t^{1-i}x_j^{-1};q\bigr)_\tau}{\bigl(\epsilon bq^{\frac{1}{2}}x_j,\epsilon bq^{\frac{1}{2}}x_j^{-1};q\bigr)_\infty}\qquad(t=q^\tau)\tag{8.34}$$

if $\nu\in P_L(l;\epsilon)$ and zero otherwise,

$$N_3^3(x;\epsilon):=\prod_{i=1}^{n-r}\frac{\bigl(-\epsilon^{-1}qt^{r+i-1},-\epsilon^{-1}qat^{r+i-1},\epsilon^{-1}q^{\frac{1}{2}}x_i,\epsilon^{-1}q^{\frac{1}{2}}x_i^{-1};q\bigr)_\infty}{\bigl(\epsilon^{-1}q^{\frac{1}{2}}x_i,\epsilon^{-1}q^{\frac{1}{2}}x_i^{-1},\epsilon^{-1}q^{\frac{1}{2}}t^lx_i,\epsilon^{-1}q^{\frac{1}{2}}t^lx_i^{-1};q\bigr)_\infty}\tag{8.35}$$

and

$$N_3^4(\nu,x;\epsilon):=\prod_{\substack{0\le i\le l-1\\1\le j\le n-r}}\frac{\bigl(\epsilon^{-1}q^{\frac{1}{2}+\nu_i}t^lx_j,\epsilon^{-1}q^{\frac{1}{2}+\nu_i}t^lx_j^{-1};q\bigr)_{\nu_{i+1}-\nu_i}}{\bigl(\epsilon^{-1}q^{\frac{1}{2}+\nu_i}t^ix_j,\epsilon^{-1}q^{\frac{1}{2}+\nu_i}t^ix_j^{-1};q\bigr)_{\nu_{i+1}-\nu_i}}\tag{8.36}$$

if $\nu\in P_L(l;\epsilon)$ and zero otherwise, where $\nu_0=0$. We can proceed now as in the proof of **(ii)**. Note that N_3^1 is bounded on T^{n-r}. For N_3^2 it follows from Lemma 8.2 **(a)** that $\lim_{k\to\infty}N_3^2(\nu,x;\epsilon_k)=1$ for all $\nu\in P(l)$, $x\in T^{n-r}$ and that

$$\sup_{(\nu,x,k)\in P(l)\times T^{n-r}\times\mathbb{N}_0}|N_3^2(\nu,x;\epsilon_k)|<\infty$$

for generic $\epsilon_0>q^{\frac{1}{2}}$. By Lemma 8.2**(c)** and the fact that $0<a<1/q$, we have for generic $\epsilon_0>0$ that $\lim_{k\to\infty}N_3^3(x;\epsilon_k)=0$ for all $x\in T^{n-r}$ and

$$\sup_{(x,k)\in T^{n-r}\times\mathbb{N}_0}|N_3^3(x;\epsilon_k)|<\infty.$$

Finally, we can use Lemma 8.2**(b)** to prove that $\lim_{k\to\infty}N_3^4(\nu,x;\epsilon_k)=t^{2(n-r)|\nu|}$ for all $\nu\in P(l)$, $x\in T^{n-r}$ and that

$$\sup_{(\nu,x,k)\in P(l)\times T^{n-r}\times\mathbb{N}_0}|N_3^4(\nu,x;\epsilon_k)|<\infty$$

for generic $\epsilon_0>q^{\frac{1}{2}}$. This completes the proof of **(iii)**.

9. Proof of Proposition 7.4.

We first give a new expression for the weight $\underline{c}_B$ appearing in the definition of $\langle .,. \rangle_B$.

Lemma 9.1. *The weight* $\underline{c}_B \in \big(\mathbb{C}^*\big)^{n+1}$ *can be rewritten as*

$$
\begin{aligned}
c_{B,j} =& \big(q;q\big)_\infty^n \prod_{i=1}^{j} \frac{\theta(-t^{i+j-n}c/d)}{\theta(-t^{1-i}d/c)\theta(-t^{i}c/d)} \prod_{i=1}^{n-j} \frac{1}{\theta(-t^{1-i}c/d)} \\
& .q^{-2\tau^2\left((n-j)\binom{j}{2}+\binom{j}{3}+\binom{n-j}{3}\right)} t^{-\binom{j}{2}-\binom{n-j}{2}} \\
& .c^{-2\tau\left(j(n-j)+\binom{j}{2}\right)-j} d^{-2\tau\binom{n-j}{2}+j-n}
\end{aligned}
\tag{9.1}
$$

for $j = 0, 1, \ldots, n$.

Proof. For $j = 0$, (9.1) follows from (7.8) since $c_{B,j} = c_B d_{B,j}$ with $d_{B,0} = 1$. For $j \in \{1, \ldots, n\}$, write $\tilde{c}_{B,j}$ for the right hand side of (9.1), then by the explicit expression (7.5) for $d_{B,j}$ it remains to prove that

$$
\frac{\tilde{c}_{B,j}}{\tilde{c}_{B,j-1}} = \prod_{m=j+1}^{n} \Psi_t(-t^{n-m-j+1}d/c)
$$

for $j \in \{1, \ldots, n\}$, with Ψ_t given by (7.6). This follows by a direct calculation. ☐

The proof of Proposition 7.4 is similar to the proof of Proposition 6.3. Again, we indicate the main steps in the computation. We freely use the notations of previous sections. We fix in this section $(a,b,c,d) \in V_B$ with $a, b \neq 0$. The conditions $a, b \neq 0$ are not essential; with slight modifications, the proof goes also through when $a = 0$ or $b = 0$.

For $\epsilon \in \mathbb{R}_{>0}$ we set $\rho_{B,j}(\epsilon) := t_{B,0}(\epsilon)t^{j-1} = (qc/d)^{\frac{1}{2}}\epsilon^{-1}t^{j-1}$ and $\sigma_{B,j}(\epsilon) := t_{B,1}(\epsilon)t^{j-1} = -(qd/c)^{\frac{1}{2}}\epsilon^{-1}t^{j-1}$ for $j \in \mathbb{Z}$, where $\underline{t}_B(\epsilon)$ is given by (7.14). Then we have for $\epsilon > 0$ sufficiently small,

$$
F(r; \underline{t}_B(\epsilon); t) = \bigcup_{\substack{l+m=r \\ l,m \in \mathbb{N}_0}} D_0(l; \underline{t}_B(\epsilon); t) \times D_1(m; \underline{t}_B(\epsilon); t) \subset \mathbb{C}^r
$$

where $F(r)$ is given by (5.3) and

$$
\begin{aligned}
D_0(l; \underline{t}_B(\epsilon); t) &= \{\rho_B(\epsilon)q^\nu \,|\, \nu \in P_B^{(0)}(l;\epsilon)\}, \\
P_B^{(0)}(l;\epsilon) &:= \{\nu \in P(l) \,|\, |\rho_{B,l}(\epsilon)q^{\nu_l}| > 1\},
\end{aligned}
\tag{9.2}
$$

if $l > 0$, respectively

$$
\begin{aligned}
D_1(m; \underline{t}_B(\epsilon); t) &= \{\sigma_B(\epsilon)q^\nu \,|\, \nu \in P_B^{(1)}(m;\epsilon)\}, \\
P_B^{(1)}(m;\epsilon) &:= \{\nu \in P(m) \,|\, |\sigma_{B,m}(\epsilon)q^{\nu_m}| > 1\}
\end{aligned}
\tag{9.3}
$$

if $m > 0$. We write

$$
\begin{aligned}
&\left(\prod_{i=1}^{n}\big(-\epsilon^{-2}qt^{i-1};q\big)_\infty\right)\big((cd/q)^{\frac{1}{2}}\epsilon\big)^{|\lambda|+|\mu|}\langle m_\lambda, m_\mu\rangle_{\underline{t}_B(\epsilon),t} \\
&= \sum_{r,l,m,\nu,\nu'} \iint_{x\in T^{n-r}} \big(m_\lambda m_\mu\big)\big(\rho_B q^\nu, \sigma_B q^{\nu'}, (cd/q)^{\frac{1}{2}}\epsilon x \,|\, (cd/q)^{\frac{1}{2}}\epsilon\big)\mathcal{W}^B_{l,m;r}(\nu,\nu',x;\epsilon)\frac{dx}{x}
\end{aligned}
\tag{9.4}
$$

where $\rho_{B,i} := ct^{i-1}$, $\sigma_{B,i} := -dt^{i-1}$ and $m_\lambda(z|u)$ is given by (6.12), and the sum is over five tuples (r, l, m, ν, ν') with $r \in \{0, \ldots, n\}$, $l, m \in \mathbb{N}_0$ with $l + m = r$, $\nu \in P(l)$, $\nu' \in P(m)$, and with the renormalized weight $\mathcal{W}^B_{l,m;r}(\nu, \nu', x; \epsilon)$ given by

$$\mathcal{W}^B_{l,m;r}(\nu, \nu', x; \epsilon) := \frac{2^r \big(n-r+1\big)_r}{(2\pi i)^{n-r}} \Delta^{AWB}_{1,l,m}(\nu, \nu'; \epsilon) \Delta^{AWB}_{2,l,m}(\nu, \nu', x; \epsilon) \tag{9.5}$$

when $r = l + m$, with

$$\begin{aligned} \Delta^{AWB}_{1,l,m}(\nu, \nu'; \epsilon) := &\left(\prod_{i=1}^{r} \big(-\epsilon^{-2} q t^{i-1}; q\big)_\infty \right) \delta_c\big(\rho_B(\epsilon) q^\nu; \sigma_B(\epsilon) q^{\nu'}\big) \\ &.\Delta^{(d)}\big(\rho_B(\epsilon) q^\nu; t_{B,0}(\epsilon)\big) \Delta^{(d)}\big(\sigma_B(\epsilon) q^{\nu'}; t_{B,1}(\epsilon)\big) \end{aligned} \tag{9.6}$$

if $\nu \in P^{(0)}_B(l; \epsilon)$, $\nu' \in P^{(1)}_B(m; \epsilon)$ and zero otherwise,

$$\begin{aligned} \Delta^{AWB}_{2,l,m}(\nu, \nu', x; \epsilon) := &\prod_{i=1}^{n-r} \big(-\epsilon^{-2} q t^{r+i-1}; q\big)_\infty \\ &.\Delta(x; \underline{t}_B(\epsilon); t) \delta_c\big(\rho_B(\epsilon) q^\nu; x\big) \delta_c(\sigma_B\big(\epsilon\big) q^{\nu'}; x\big) \end{aligned} \tag{9.7}$$

if $\nu \in P^{(0)}_B(l; \epsilon)$, $\nu' \in P^{(1)}_B(m; \epsilon)$ and zero otherwise, with δ_c given by (3.12). We use the obvious conventions when $l = 0$, $m = 0$ or $r = n$ (compare with the little q-Jacobi case in section 8). In particular, we have $\Delta^{AWB}_{2,l,n-l}(\nu, \nu'; \epsilon) = 1$ for $\nu \in P^{(0)}_B(l; \epsilon)$, $\nu' \in P^{(1)}_B(n - l; \epsilon)$ and $l \in \{0, \ldots, n\}$.

We will use Lebesgue's Dominated Convergence Theorem to pull a limit $\epsilon_k \downarrow 0$ in the right hand side of (9.4) through the integration over $x \in T^{n-r}$ and through the infinite sums over $\nu \in P(l)$ and $\nu' \in P(m)$ for some sequence $\{\epsilon_k\}_{k \in \mathbb{N}_0}$ in $\mathbb{R}_{>0}$ converging to 0. We use the following lemma.

Lemma 9.2. *Keep the notations and conventions as above. Let $l, m \in \mathbb{N}_0$ with $l + m \in \{0, \ldots, n\}$ and write $r := l + m$. Then there exists a sequence $\{\epsilon_k\}_{k \in \mathbb{N}_0}$ in $\mathbb{R}_{>0}$ converging to 0 such that*
(i) *for all $\nu \in P(l)$, $\nu' \in P(m)$ we have*

$$\lim_{k \to \infty} \Delta^{AWB}_{1,l,m}(\nu, \nu'; \epsilon_k) = \big(q; q\big)_\infty^{-2r} c_{B,l} \Delta^B(\rho_B q^\nu, \sigma_B q^{\nu'}) \prod_{i=1}^{l} \rho_{B,i} q^{\nu_i} \prod_{j=1}^{m} |\sigma_{B,j}| q^{\nu'_j},$$

and there exists a $K \in \mathbb{R}_{>0}$ independent of $\nu \in P(l)$ and $\nu' \in P(m)$ such that

$$\sup_{k \in \mathbb{N}_0} |\Delta^{AWB}_{1,l,m}(\nu, \nu'; \epsilon_k)| \leq K c_{B,l} \Delta^B(\rho_B q^\nu, \sigma_B q^{\nu'}) \prod_{i=1}^{l} \rho_{B,i} q^{\nu_i} \prod_{j=1}^{m} |\sigma_{B,j}| q^{\nu'_j}.$$

for all $\nu \in P(l)$ and all $\nu' \in P(m)$, where $\Delta^B(z) = \Delta^B(z; a, b, c, d; t)$ is given by (7.3).
(ii) *if $r < n$, then $\lim_{k \to \infty} \Delta^{AWB}_{2,l,m}(\nu, \nu', x; \epsilon_k) = 0$ for all $\nu \in P(l)$, $\nu' \in P(m)$, $x \in T^{n-r}$ and*

$$\sup_{(k, \nu, \nu', x) \in \mathbb{N}_0 \times P(l) \times P(m) \times T^{n-r}} |\Delta^{AWB}_{2,l,m}(\nu, \nu', x; \epsilon_k)| < \infty.$$

Before we prove Lemma 9.2, we complete the proof of Proposition 7.4. As we have already remarked before, we have that the infinite sum

$$(1-q)^{-n}\langle 1,1\rangle_B=\sum_{(\nu,\nu',l)}c_{B,l}\Delta^B(\rho_Bq^{\nu},\sigma_Bq^{\nu'})\prod_{i=1}^{l}\rho_{B,i}q^{\nu_i}\prod_{j=1}^{n-l}|\sigma_{B,j}|q^{\nu'_j}\tag{9.8}$$

is absolutely convergent, where the sum is taken over the three tuples (ν,ν',l) with $\nu\in P(l)$ and $\nu'\in P(n-l)$ and $l\in\{0,\ldots,n\}$. Since

$$\sup_{\nu,\nu',x,\epsilon}|m_\lambda\big(\rho_Bq^{\nu},\sigma_Bq^{\nu'},(cd/q)^{\frac{1}{2}}\epsilon x|(cd/q)^{\frac{1}{2}}\epsilon\big)|<\infty,$$

where the supremum is taken over the four tuples (ν,ν',x,ϵ) with $\nu\in P_B^{(0)}(l;\epsilon)$, $\nu'\in P_B^{(1)}(m;\epsilon)$, $x\in T^{n-r}$ $(r=l+m)$ and $\epsilon>0$, we obtain by Lebesgue's Dominated Convergence Theorem, (6.13), (9.4), (9.8) and Lemma 9.2

$$\begin{aligned}
&\lim_{k\to\infty}\left(\prod_{i=1}^{n}(-\epsilon_k^{-2}qt^{i-1};q)_\infty\right)\big((cd/q)^{\frac{1}{2}}\epsilon_k\big)^{|\lambda|+|\mu|}\langle m_\lambda,m_\mu\rangle_{\underline{t}_B(\epsilon_k),t}\\
&=\frac{2^nn!}{(q;q)_\infty^{2n}}\sum_{l=0}^{n}\sum_{\substack{\nu\in P(l)\\ \nu'\in P(n-l)}}c_{B,l}\big(\tilde{m}_\lambda\tilde{m}_\mu\Delta^B\big)(\rho_Bq^{\nu},\sigma_Bq^{\nu'})\prod_{i=1}^{l}\rho_{B,i}q^{\nu_i}\prod_{j=1}^{n-l}|\sigma_{B,j}|q^{\nu'_j}\\
&=2^nn!(1-q)^{-n}(q;q)_\infty^{-2n}\langle\tilde{m}_\lambda,\tilde{m}_\mu\rangle_{B,t}^{a,b,c,d},
\end{aligned}$$

for some sequence $\{\epsilon_k\}_{k\in\mathbb{N}_0}$ in $\mathbb{R}_{>0}$ converging to 0. So for the proof of Proposition 7.4, it suffices to prove Lemma 9.2.
Proof of Lemma 9.2.
Using the explicit expressions for $\Delta^{(d)}$ (3.5), δ_c (3.12) and $\underline{t}_B(\epsilon)$ (7.14), we can write

$$\Delta_{1,l,m}^{AWB}(\nu,\nu';\epsilon):=U_0(\nu,\nu';l,m)U_+(\epsilon;\nu,\nu';l,m)U_-(\epsilon;\nu,\nu';l,m)\tag{9.9}$$

with U_0,U_+ respectively U_- the factor of $\Delta_{1,l,m}^{AW}$ consisting of products of q-shifted factorials of the form $(e;q)_s$, $(\epsilon^2e;q)_s$ respectively $(\epsilon^{-2}e;q)_s$ $(s\in\mathbb{N}_0\cup\{\infty\})$. By a straightforward computation, the factors U_0,U_+ and U_- can be explicitly given by

$$\begin{aligned}
U_0(\nu,\nu';l,m):=&\Psi_0(\nu,l;a,b,c,d)\Psi_0(\nu',m;b,a,d,c)\\
&\cdot\prod_{\substack{1\le i\le l\\ 1\le j\le m}}\big(-t^{i-j}q^{\nu_i-\nu'_j}c/d,-t^{j-i}q^{\nu'_j-\nu_i}d/c;q\big)_\tau
\end{aligned}\tag{9.10}$$

if $(\nu,\nu')\in P_0(l;\epsilon)\times P_1(m;\epsilon)$, and zero otherwise, with $t=q^\tau$ and with

$$\begin{aligned}
\Psi_0(\nu,l;a,&b,c,d):=F_1(\nu)\\
&\cdot\prod_{i=1}^{l}\frac{1}{\big(q,-t^{1-i}q^{-\nu_{i-1}}d/c,at^{i-1}q^{\nu_{i-1}+1},-bt^{i-1}q^{\nu_{i-1}+1}c/d;q\big)_\infty}\\
&\cdot\prod_{i=1}^{l}\frac{\big(at^{i-1}q^{\nu_{i-1}+1},-bt^{i-1}q^{\nu_{i-1}+1}c/d;q\big)_{\nu_i-\nu_{i-1}}}{\big(q,-t^{i-1}q^{\nu_{i-1}+1}c/d;q\big)_{\nu_i-\nu_{i-1}}\big(abt^{i-1}q^{\nu_{i-1}+1}\big)^{\nu_i-\nu_{i-1}}}
\end{aligned}\tag{9.11}$$

where $\nu_0 = 0$ and $F_1(\nu)$ is given by (8.11), and

$$\begin{aligned} U_+(\epsilon;\nu,\nu';l,m) :=&\Psi_+(\epsilon;\nu,l;a,b,c,d)\Psi_+(\epsilon;\nu',m;b,a,d,c)\\ &\cdot\prod_{\substack{1\le i\le l\\ 1\le j\le m}}\big(-\epsilon^2t^{2-i-j}q^{-1-\nu_i-\nu'_j};q\big)_\tau \end{aligned}\tag{9.12}$$

if $(\nu,\nu')\in P_B^{(0)}(l;\epsilon)\times P_B^{(1)}(m;\epsilon)$ and zero otherwise, with

$$\begin{aligned} \Psi_+(\epsilon;\nu,l;a,b,c,d) :=& \prod_{i=1}^{l}\frac{\big(\epsilon^2t^{2(1-i)}q^{-2\nu_{i-1}-1}d/c;q\big)_\infty}{\big(\epsilon^2at^{1-i}q^{-\nu_{i-1}}d/c,-\epsilon^2bt^{1-i}q^{-\nu_{i-1}};q\big)_\infty}\\ &\cdot\prod_{1\le i<j\le l}\big(\epsilon^2t^{2-i-j}q^{-\nu_i-\nu_j-1}d/c;q\big)_\tau \end{aligned}\tag{9.13}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} U_-(\epsilon;\nu,\nu';l,m) :=& \Psi_-(\epsilon;\nu,l;a,b,c,d)\Psi_-(\epsilon;\nu',m;b,a,d,c)\\ &\cdot\left(\prod_{j=1}^{m}\frac{\big(-\epsilon^{-2}qt^{l+j-1};q\big)_\infty}{\big(-\epsilon^{-2}qt^{j-1};q\big)_\infty}\right)\prod_{\substack{1\le i\le l\\ 1\le j\le m}}\big(-\epsilon^{-2}t^{i+j-2}q^{\nu_i+\nu'_j+1};q\big)_\tau \end{aligned}\tag{9.14}$$

if $(\nu,\nu')\in P_B^{(0)}(l;\epsilon)\times P_B^{(1)}(m;\epsilon)$ and zero otherwise, with

$$\begin{aligned} \Psi_-(\epsilon;\nu,l;a,b,c,d) :=& \prod_{i=1}^{l}\frac{\big(\epsilon^{-2}t^{2(i-1)}q^{2\nu_i+1}c/d;q\big)_1}{\big(\epsilon^{-2}t^{2(i-1)}q^{2\nu_{i-1}+1}c/d;q\big)_1}\\ &\cdot\prod_{i=1}^{l}\frac{\big(\epsilon^{-2}t^{2(i-1)}q^{2\nu_{i-1}+1}c/d,-\epsilon^{-2}t^{i-1}q^{\nu_{i-1}+1};q\big)_{\nu_i-\nu_{i-1}}}{\big(\epsilon^{-2}a^{-1}t^{i-1}q^{\nu_{i-1}+1}c/d,-\epsilon^{-2}b^{-1}t^{i-1}q^{\nu_{i-1}+1};q\big)_{\nu_i-\nu_{i-1}}}\\ &\cdot\frac{\prod_{i=1}^{l}\big(-\epsilon^{-2}qt^{i-1};q\big)_{\nu_{i-1}}}{\prod_{1\le i<j\le l}\big(\epsilon^{-2}t^{i+j-2}q^{\nu_{i-1}+\nu_j+1}c/d;q\big)_{\nu_i-\nu_{i-1}}}. \end{aligned}\tag{9.15}$$

For given $\epsilon_0\in\mathbb{R}^*$, we write $\epsilon_k := \epsilon_0q^k$. Then for generic $\epsilon_0>0$ we have

$$\lim_{k\to\infty}U_+(\epsilon_k;\nu,\nu';l,m) = 1\tag{9.16}$$

for all $(\nu,\nu')\in P(l)\times P(m)$ by Lemma 8.2**(a)**. By (8.25), we have for generic $\epsilon_0>0$

$$\begin{aligned} &\lim_{k\to\infty}\frac{\prod_{i=1}^{l}\big(-\epsilon_k^{-2}qt^{i-1};q\big)_{\nu_{i-1}}}{\prod_{1\le i<j\le l}\big(\epsilon_k^{-2}t^{i+j-2}q^{\nu_{i-1}+\nu_j+1}c/d;q\big)_{\nu_i-\nu_{i-1}}}\\ &=\prod_{i=1}^{l}q^{\binom{\nu_{i-1}+1}{2}}t^{(i-1)\nu_{i-1}}\prod_{1\le i<j\le l}\big(-t^{i+j-2}q^{\nu_{i-1}+\nu_j+1}c/d\big)^{\nu_{i-1}-\nu_i}q^{-\binom{\nu_i-\nu_{i-1}}{2}} \end{aligned}\tag{9.17}$$

for the factor of Ψ_- in the third line of (9.15). The factor of U_- in the second line of (9.14) can be rewritten as

$$\begin{aligned}&\left(\prod_{j=1}^{m}\frac{\left(-\epsilon^{-2}qt^{l+j-1};q\right)_\infty}{\left(-\epsilon^{-2}qt^{j-1};q\right)_\infty}\right)\prod_{\substack{1\leq i\leq l\\1\leq j\leq m}}\left(-\epsilon^{-2}t^{i+j-2}q^{\nu_i+\nu'_j+1};q\right)_\tau\\&\qquad=\prod_{\substack{1\leq i\leq l\\1\leq j\leq m}}\frac{\left(-\epsilon^{-2}qt^{i+j-1};q\right)_{\nu_i+\nu'_j}}{\left(-\epsilon^{-2}qt^{i+j-2};q\right)_{\nu_i+\nu'_j}}.\end{aligned}\tag{9.18}$$

It follows then from (9.14), (9.15), (9.17), (9.18) and Lemma 8.2**(b)** that for generic $\epsilon_0>0$,

$$\lim_{k\to\infty}U_-(\epsilon_k;\nu,\nu';l,m)=t^{m|\nu|+l|\nu'|}\Psi_-^\infty(\nu,l;a,b,c,d)\Psi_-^\infty(\nu',m;b,a,d,c)\tag{9.19}$$

with

$$\begin{aligned}\Psi_-^\infty(\nu,l;a,b,c,d):=&\prod_{i=1}^{l}\left(t^{i-1}q^{\nu_{i-1}+2}ab\right)^{\nu_i-\nu_{i-1}}q^{\binom{\nu_{i-1}+1}{2}}t^{(i-1)\nu_{i-1}}\\&\cdot\prod_{1\leq i<j\leq l}\left(-t^{i+j-2}q^{\nu_{i-1}+\nu_j+1}c/d\right)^{\nu_{i-1}-\nu_i}q^{-\binom{\nu_i-\nu_{i-1}}{2}}.\end{aligned}\tag{9.20}$$

We will rewrite now U_0 in the form

$$\begin{aligned}U_0(\nu,\nu';l,m)=&\left(q;q\right)_\infty^{-r}\prod_{i=1}^{l}\frac{\theta(-t^{i-m}c/d)}{\theta(-t^{1-i}d/c)\theta(-t^ic/d)}\prod_{j=1}^{m}\frac{1}{\theta(-t^{1-j}c/d)}\\&.C_0(\nu,\nu';l,m)\Delta^B(\rho_Bq^\nu,\sigma_Bq^{\nu'};a,b,c,d;t)\end{aligned}\tag{9.21}$$

and we determine the factor $C_0(\nu,\nu';l,m)$ explicitly. Using (7.9) and the formula $\theta(x)=\theta(qx^{-1})$ for the Jacobi theta function $\theta(x)$ (7.7), we can rewrite the factor $\Psi_0(\nu,l;a,b,c,d)$ (9.11) as

$$\begin{aligned}&\Psi_0(\nu,l;a,b,c,d)=F_1(\nu)\\&\quad\cdot\prod_{i=1}^{l}\frac{v_B(\rho_{B,i}q^{\nu_i};a,b,c,d)(t^{i-1}c/d)^{\nu_{i-1}}q^{\binom{\nu_{i-1}+1}{2}}}{\theta(-t^{1-i}d/c)\left(q^{\nu_i+1}t^{i-1};q\right)_\infty\left(q;q\right)_{\nu_i-\nu_{i-1}}(abt^{i-1}q^{\nu_{i-1}+1})^{\nu_i-\nu_{i-1}}}\end{aligned}\tag{9.22}$$

where v_B (7.4) is the one-variable weight function for the big q-Jacobi polynomials. Since $v_B(-dx;a,b,c,d)=v_B(dx;b,a,d,c)$, we obtain from (9.22)

$$\begin{aligned}&\Psi_0(\nu',m;b,a,d,c)=F_1(\nu')\\&\quad\cdot\prod_{j=1}^{m}\frac{v_B(\sigma_{B,j}q^{\nu'_j};a,b,c,d)(t^{j-1}d/c)^{\nu'_{j-1}}q^{\binom{\nu'_{j-1}+1}{2}}}{\theta(-t^{1-j}c/d)\left(q^{\nu'_j+1}t^{j-1};q\right)_\infty\left(q;q\right)_{\nu'_j-\nu'_{j-1}}(abt^{j-1}q^{\nu'_{j-1}+1})^{\nu'_j-\nu'_{j-1}}}.\end{aligned}\tag{9.23}$$

The factor $F_1(\nu)$ (8.11) of $\Psi_0(\nu,l;a,b,c,d)$ can be rewritten as

$$\begin{aligned}F_1(\nu)=&\delta_{qJ}(\rho_Bq^\nu)q^{-2\tau^2\binom{l}{3}}c^{-l(l-1)\tau}\prod_{i=1}^{l}\frac{\left(t^{i-1}q^{1+\nu_i};q\right)_\infty}{\left(q^{1+\nu_i-\nu_{i-1}};q\right)_\infty}t^{-2(l-i)\nu_i}\\&\cdot\prod_{1\leq i<j\leq l}\left(-q^{\nu_j-\nu_i+1}t^{j-i}\right)^{\nu_i-\nu_{i-1}}q^{\binom{\nu_i-\nu_{i-1}}{2}}\end{aligned}\tag{9.24}$$

for $\nu \in P(l)$ where δ_{qJ} is given by (6.9) and $t = q^\tau$. This follows from (8.13) since $\delta_{qJ}(\rho_B q^\nu) = c^{l(l-1)\tau}\delta_{qJ}(\rho_L q^\nu)$ for $\nu \in P(l)$ (here $\rho_{L,i} = t^{i-1}$). Similarly, we have for the factor $F_1(\nu')$ of $\Psi_0(\nu', m; b, a, d, c)$,

$$\begin{aligned} F_1(\nu') =&\delta_{qJ}(\sigma_B q^{\nu'})q^{-2\tau^2\binom{m}{3}}d^{-m(m-1)\tau}\prod_{j=1}^{m}\frac{\big(t^{j-1}q^{1+\nu'_j};q\big)_\infty}{\big(q^{1+\nu'_j-\nu'_{j-1}};q\big)_\infty}t^{-2(m-j)\nu'_j} \\ &\cdot\prod_{1\le i<j\le m}\big(-q^{\nu'_j-\nu'_i+1}t^{j-i}\big)^{\nu'_i-\nu'_{i-1}}q^{\binom{\nu'_i-\nu'_{i-1}}{2}}, \end{aligned} \tag{9.25}$$

since $\delta_{qJ}(\sigma_B q^{\nu'}) = d^{m(m-1)\tau}\delta_{qJ}(\rho_L q^{\nu'})$ for $\nu' \in P(m)$.

Finally, we set for $z = (z_1, \ldots, z_r)$ with $r := l + m$,

$$\tilde{\delta}^l_{qJ}(z) := \prod_{\substack{1\le i\le l\\ l+1\le j\le r}} |z_i - z_j||z_i|^{2\tau-1}\big(qt^{-1}z_j/z_i;q\big)_{2\tau-1},$$

then the factor of U_0 in the second line of (9.10) can be rewritten as

$$\begin{aligned} &\prod_{\substack{1\le i\le l\\ 1\le j\le m}}\big(-t^{i-j}q^{\nu_i-\nu'_j}c/d, -t^{j-i}q^{\nu'_j-\nu_i}d/c;q\big)_\tau \\ &\qquad = \tilde{\delta}^l_{qJ}(\rho_B q^\nu, \sigma_B q^{\nu'})t^{m|\nu|-l|\nu'|}\prod_{i=1}^{l}\frac{\theta(-t^{i-m}c/d)}{\theta(-t^ic/d)\big(ct^{i-1}q^{\nu_i}\big)^{2m\tau}} \end{aligned} \tag{9.26}$$

for $\nu \in P(l)$ and $\nu' \in P(m)$, since we have for $i \in \{1, \ldots, l\}$, $j \in \{1, \ldots, m\}$ that

$$\begin{aligned} &\big(-t^{i-j}q^{\nu_i-\nu'_j}c/d, -t^{j-i}q^{\nu'_j-\nu_i}d/c;q\big)_\tau \\ &\qquad = \frac{\theta(-t^{i-j}c/d)\big(-t^{j-i-1}q^{1+\nu'_j-\nu_i}d/c;q\big)_\infty}{\theta(-t^{i-j+1}c/d)\big(-t^{j-i+1}q^{\nu'_j-\nu_i}d/c;q\big)_\infty}\big(1+t^{j-i}q^{\nu'_j-\nu_i}d/c\big)t^{\nu_i-\nu'_j} \end{aligned} \tag{9.27}$$

(formula (9.27) follows from a straightforward computation using (4.3), (7.9) and $\theta(x) = \theta(qx^{-1})$). Since we have

$$\delta_{qJ}(\rho_B q^\nu, \sigma_B q^{\nu'}) = \delta_{qJ}(\rho_B q^\nu)\delta_{qJ}(\sigma_B q^{\nu'})\tilde{\delta}^l_{qJ}(\rho_B q^\nu, \sigma_B q^{\nu'})$$

for $\nu \in P(l)$ and $\nu' \in P(m)$, we obtain from (7.3), (9.10), (9.22), (9.23), (9.24), (9.25) and (9.26) that (9.21) holds with

$$\begin{aligned} C_0(\nu, \nu'; l, m) =&t^{-m|\nu|-l|\nu'|}c^{-2lm\tau}q^{-2m\binom{l}{2}\tau^2} \\ &.\hat{C}_0(\nu, l; a, b, c, d)\hat{C}_0(\nu', m; b, a, d, c) \end{aligned} \tag{9.28}$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} \hat{C}_0(\nu, l; a, b, c, d) :=& q^{-2\tau^2\binom{l}{3}}c^{-2\binom{l}{2}\tau} \\ &\cdot\prod_{i=1}^{l}\big(t^{i-1}c/d\big)^{\nu_{i-1}}q^{\binom{\nu_{i-1}+1}{2}}t^{-2(l-i)\nu_i}\big(abt^{i-1}q^{\nu_{i-1}+1}\big)^{\nu_{i-1}-\nu_i} \\ &\cdot\prod_{1\le i<j\le l}\big(-q^{\nu_j-\nu_i+1}t^{j-i}\big)^{\nu_i-\nu_{i-1}}q^{\binom{\nu_i-\nu_{i-1}}{2}}. \end{aligned} \tag{9.29}$$

We have by Lemma 9.1 (with n in the right hand side of (9.1) equal to $r = l + m$ in this situation) by (9.9), (9.16), (9.19), (9.21) and (9.28) that for generic $\epsilon_0 > 0$,

$$\begin{aligned}\lim_{k\to\infty} \Delta^{AWB}_{1,l,m}(\nu,\nu';\epsilon_k) &= U_0(\nu,\nu';l,m) \lim_{k\to\infty} U_-(\epsilon_k;\nu,\nu';l,m)\\ &= \big(q;q\big)_\infty^{-2r} c_{B,l}\Delta^B(\rho_B q^{\nu}, \sigma_B q^{\nu'}; a,b,c,d;t)\\ &\quad .E(\nu,l;a,b,c,d)E(\nu',m;b,a,d,c)\end{aligned} \tag{9.30}$$

for $\nu \in P(l)$ and $\nu' \in P(m)$, with

$$E(\nu,l;a,b,c,d) := q^{2\tau^2\binom{l}{3}} t^{\binom{l}{2}} c^{2\binom{l}{2}\tau + l} \hat{C}_0(\nu,l;a,b,c,d)\Psi_-^\infty(\nu,l;a,b,c,d). \tag{9.31}$$

By (9.20) and (9.29), we obtain

$$E(\nu,l;a,b,c,d) = c^l t^{\binom{l}{2}} q^{|\nu|} = \prod_{i=1}^{l} \rho_{B,i} q^{\nu_i}, \quad \nu \in P(l).$$

In particular we have $E(\nu',m;b,a,d,c) = \prod_{j=1}^{m} |\sigma_{B,j}| q^{\nu'_j}$ for $\nu' \in P(m)$, hence by (9.30)

$$\lim_{k\to\infty} \Delta^{AWB}_{1,l,m}(\nu,\nu';\epsilon_k) = \big(q;q\big)_\infty^{-2r} c_{B,l}\Delta^B(\rho_B q^{\nu}, \sigma_B q^{\nu'}) \prod_{i=1}^{l} \rho_{B,i} q^{\nu_i} \prod_{j=1}^{m} |\sigma_{B,j}| q^{\nu'_j}$$

for all $\nu \in P(l)$, $\nu' \in P(m)$. To complete the proof of Lemma 9.2**(i)**, it suffices to prove that for generic $\epsilon_0 > \max\big((qc/d)^{\frac{1}{2}}, (qd/c)^{\frac{1}{2}}\big)$,

$$\sup_{k\in\mathbb{N}_0} |\Delta^{AWB}_{1,l,m}(\nu,\nu';\epsilon_k)| \leq K c_{B,l}\Delta^B(\rho_B q^{\nu}, \sigma_B q^{\nu'}; a,b,c,d;t) \prod_{i=1}^{l} \rho_{B,i} q^{\nu_i} \prod_{i=1}^{m} |\sigma_{B,j}| q^{\nu'_j}$$

for all $\nu \in P(l)$ and all $\nu' \in P(m)$, with $K > 0$ independent of ν and ν'. This can be proved by similar arguments as in the little q-Jacobi case (see proof of Lemma 8.1**(i)**). In particular, the estimates for almost all factors of $\Delta^{AWB}_{1,l,m}$ can be obtained from one of the three estimates of Lemma 8.2. Only for the factor in the third line of the expression of Ψ_- (9.15) one needs a seperate argument to establish the desired estimate. We may assume that this factor is zero unless $\nu \in P_B^{(0)}(l;\epsilon)$ and $\nu' \in P_B^{(1)}(m;\epsilon)$. Since we have the limit (9.17), we would like to establish the estimate

$$\begin{aligned}&\sup_{\{k\in\mathbb{N}_0 | \nu\in P_B^{(0)}(l;\epsilon_k) \text{ and } \nu'\in P_B^{(1)}(m;\epsilon_k)\}} \left| \frac{\prod_{i=1}^{l}\big(-\epsilon_k^{-2} q t^{i-1};q\big)_{\nu_{i-1}}}{\prod_{1\leq i<j\leq l}\big(\epsilon_k^{-2} t^{i+j-2} q^{\nu_j+\nu_{i-1}+1} c/d;q\big)_{\nu_i-\nu_{i-1}}} \right|\\ &\leq K' \prod_{i=1}^{l} q^{\binom{\nu_{i-1}+1}{2}} t^{(i-1)\nu_{i-1}} \prod_{1\leq i<j\leq l} \big(t^{i+j-2} q^{\nu_{i-1}+\nu_j+1} c/d\big)^{\nu_{i-1}-\nu_i} q^{-\binom{\nu_i-\nu_{i-1}}{2}}\end{aligned}$$

for some $K' > 0$ independent of $\nu \in P(l)$ and $\nu' \in P(m)$, for generic $\epsilon_0 > \max\big((qc/d)^{\frac{1}{2}}, (qd/c)^{\frac{1}{2}}\big)$. This can be done similarly as we have done for the factor N_1^3 (8.19) in the little q-Jacobi case.

The proof of Lemma 9.2**(ii)** is similar to the proof of Lemma 8.1**(iii)**.

Acknowledgements. It is a pleasure to thank Prof. Masatoshi Noumi and Dr. Mathijs S. Dijkhuizen for their hospitality during my stay at Kobe university. The author thanks Prof. Tom H. Koornwinder for many valuable comments.

References

1. G.E. Andrews, R. Askey, *Enumeration of partitions: the role of Eulerian series and q-orthogonal polynomials*, in Higher Combinatorics, M. Aigner, ed., Reidel, Boston, MA (1977), pp. 3–26.
2. G.E. Andrews, R. Askey, *Classical orthogonal polynomials*, in Polynômes Orthogonaux et Applications, C. Brezinski, A. Draux, A.P. Magnus, P. Maroni and A. Ronveaux, eds., Lecture Notes in Math. **1171**, Springer, New York (1985), pp. 36–62.
3. K. Aomoto, *On Elliptic Product Formulas for Jackson Integrals associated with Reduced Root Systems*, preprint (1994).
4. R. Askey, *Some basic hypergeometric extensions of integrals of Selberg and Andrews*, SIAM J. Math. Anal. **11** (1980), pp. 938–951.
5. R. Askey, J. Wilson, *A set of orthogonal polynomials that generalize the Racah coefficients or* 6-*j symbols*, SIAM J. Math. Anal. **10** (1979), pp. 1008–1016.
6. R. Askey, J. Wilson, *Some basic hypergeometric orthogonal polynomials that generalize Jacobi polynomials*, Mem. Amer. Math. Soc. **54** (1985), no. 319.
7. T.H. Baker, P.J. Forrester, *Multivariable Al-Salam & Carlitz polynomials associated with the type A q-Dunkl kernel*, preprint (1997).
8. I. Cherednik, *Double affine Hecke algebras and Macdonald's conjectures*, Ann. Math. **141** (1995), pp. 191–216.
9. I. Cherednik, *Macdonald's evaluation conjectures and difference Fourier transform*, Invent. Math. **122** (1995), pp. 119–145.
10. I. Cherednik, *Nonsymmetric Macdonald polynomials*, IMRN **10** (1995), pp. 483–515.
11. I. Cherednik, *Intertwining operators of double affine Hecke algebras*, Selecta Math. (1997).
12. J.F. van Diejen, *Self-dual Koornwinder-Macdonald polynomials*, Invent. Math. **126** (1996), pp. 319–339.
13. J.F. van Diejen, *On certain multiple Bailey, Rogers and Dougall type summation formulas*, Preprint Centre de Recherches Mathematiques, Univ. of Montreal, CRM-2442 (1996).
14. J.F. van Diejen, J.V. Stokman, *Multivariable q-Racah polynomials*, Preprint Centre de Recherches Mathematiques, Univ. of Montreal, CRM-2369 (1996). Duke Math. J. (to appear).
15. R.J. Evans, *Multidimensional beta and gamma integrals*, Contemp. Math. 166 (1994), pp. 341–357.
16. R.A. Gustafson, *Some q-beta and Mellin-Barnes integrals on compact Lie groups and Lie algebras*, Trans. Am. Math. Soc., vol. 341, no. 1 (1994), pp. 69–119.
17. R.A. Gustafson, *A generalization of Selberg's beta integral*, Bull. Amer. Math. Soc. (N.S.) **22** (1990), pp. 97–105.
18. G. Gasper, M. Rahman, *Basic hypergeometric series*, Encyclopedia of Math. and its Appl., vol. 35, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge (1990).
19. L. Habsieger, *Une q-intégrale de Selberg et Askey*, SIAM J. Math. Anal. 19 (1988), pp. 1475–1489.
20. M. Ito, *On a theta product formula for Jackson integrals associated with root systems of rank two*, Preprint (1995).
21. K.W.J. Kadell, *A proof of Askey's conjectured q-analogue of Selberg's integral and a conjecture of Morris*, SIAM J. Math. Anal. 19 (1988), pp. 969–986.
22. J. Kaneko, *q-Selberg integrals and Macdonald polynomials*, Ann. scient. Éc. Norm. Sup., 4^e série, t. 29 (1996), pp. 583–637.
23. R. Koekoek, R.F. Swarttouw, *The Askey-scheme of hypergeometric orthogonal polynomials and its q-analogue*, Report 94-05 (Delft University of Technology, 1994).
24. T.H. Koornwinder, *Askey-Wilson polynomials for root systems of type BC*, Contemp. Math. **138** (1992), pp. 189–204.
25. I.G. Macdonald, *Orthogonal polynomials associated with root systems*, preprint (1988).
26. I.G. Macdonald, *Some conjectures for Koornwinder's orthogonal polynomials*, unpublished manuscript (1988).
27. I.G. Macdonald, *Symmetric functions and Hall polynomials*, Oxford University Press, Oxford, 2nd edition (1995).
28. I.G. Macdonald, *Affine Hecke algebras and orthogonal polynomials*, Séminaire Bourbaki No.1 **797** (1995).

29. M. Noumi, *Macdonald's symmetric polynomials as zonal spherical functions on some quantum homogeneous spaces*, Adv. Math. **123** (1996), no.1, pp. 16–77.
30. M. Noumi, *Macdonald-Koornwinder polynomials and affine Hecke algebras*, RIMS Kokyuroku **919** (1995), pp. 44–55 (in Japanese).
31. M. Noumi, T. Sugitani, *Quantum symmetric spaces and related q-orthogonal polynomials*, in 'Group Theoretical Methods in Physics', Proceedings XX ICGTMP, Toyonaka, Japan (eds. A. Arima et al.), World Scientific, Singapore, pp. 28–40.
32. J.V. Stokman, *Multivariable big and little q-Jacobi polynomials*, Siam J. Math. Anal. **28** (1997), pp. 452–480.
33. J.V. Stokman, *Two limit transitions involving multivariable BC type Askey-Wilson polynomials* in 'Quantum Groups and Quantum Spaces' (eds. R. Budzyński, W. Pusz and S. Zakrzewski), Banach Center Publications **40** (1997), pp. 415–428.
34. J.V. Stokman, *Askey-Wilson polynomials with partly discrete orthogonality measure*, The Ramanujan Journal **1** (1997), pp. 275–297.
35. J.V. Stokman, T.H. Koornwinder, *Limit transitions for BC type multivariable orthogonal polynomials*, Mathematical preprint series (Univ. of Amsterdam, 1995), report 95–19. Canad. J. Math. (to appear).
36. J.V. Stokman, T.H. Koornwinder, *On some limit cases of Askey-Wilson polynomials*, Mathematical preprint series (Univ. of Amsterdam, 1997), report 97–01. J. Approx. Theory (to appear).
37. V. Tarasov, A. Varchenko, *Geometry of q-hypergeometric functions, quantum affine algebras and elliptic quantum groups*, preprint (1997).

DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS, UNIVERSITY OF AMSTERDAM, PLANTAGE MUIDERGRACHT 24, 1018 TV AMSTERDAM, THE NETHERLANDS. EMAIL: JASPER@WINS.UVA.NL